

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. VI

MAY, 1940

No. 2



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VI

MAY, 1940

NUMBER 2

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION



BOARD OF EDITORS

CHARLES W. RAMSDELL
University of Texas

AVERY O. CRAVEN
University of Chicago

WALTER B. POSEY
Birmingham-Southern College

ROBERT S. COTTERILL
Florida State College for Women

PHILIP DAVIDSON
Agnes Scott College

FRANK L. OWSLEY
Vanderbilt University

W. NEIL FRANKLIN
The National Archives

ROBERT H. WOODY
Duke University

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

FRED C. COLE, Louisiana State University

GUARANTOR

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Louisiana State University, University, Louisiana.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to the Secretary-Treasurer.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME VI

MAY, 1940

NUMBER 2



Copyright, 1940, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Confederate Medicine.</i> By George Worthington Adams.....	151
<i>Indebted Railroads—A Problem of Reconstruction.</i> By E. G. Campbell ..	167
<i>Two Decades of Historical Activity in Virginia.</i> By Lester J. Cappon ..	189
<i>Some Economic Aspects of British West Florida, 1763-1768.</i> By C. N. Howard	201
<i>John Sharp Williams Becomes a United States Senator.</i> By George C. Osborn	222
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
The South and the Progressive Lily White Party of 1912. By George E. Mowry	237
Revolutionary Diary of William Lenoir. Edited by J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton	247
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Gipson, <i>The British Empire before the American Revolution, IV, Zones of International Friction: North America, South of the Great Lakes Region, 1748-1754</i> , by Charles F. Strong	260
Castañeda, <i>Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936, IV, The Mission Era: The Passing of the Missions, 1762-1782</i> , by George P. Hammond	261
Morris, <i>The Era of the American Revolution: Studies Inscribed to Evarts Boutell Greene</i> , by Philip Davidson	262
Sherwood, <i>A Gazetteer of the State of Georgia</i> , by J. P. Dyer	264
Palmer, <i>Marshall and Taney: Statesmen of the Law</i> , by William O. Lynch ..	265
Chitwood, <i>John Tyler: Champion of the Old South</i> , by Charles S. Sydnor ..	266
Ahl, <i>Andrew Jackson and the Constitution</i> , by J. H. Parks	268
Williams and Barker, <i>The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863, II, July 16, 1814-March 31, 1842</i> , by William C. Binkley	268
Dumond, <i>Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States</i> , by E. Merton Coulter	270
Lloyd, <i>The Slavery Controversy, 1831-1860</i> , by Gilbert Hobbs Barnes	271
Summers, <i>The Baltimore and Ohio in the Civil War</i> , by Harvey M. Rice ..	273
Hendrick, <i>Statesmen of the Lost Cause: Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet</i> , by Thomas Robson Hay	274
Miller, <i>Thaddeus Stevens</i> , by Albert V. House, Jr.	276
Long, <i>Son of Carolina</i> , by James W. Patton	277
Goodykoontz, <i>Home Missions on the American Frontier; With Particular Reference to the American Home Missionary Society</i> , by Philip D. Jordan ..	278
Brawley, <i>A Short History of the American Negro</i> , by V. L. Bedsole	279
Gittinger, <i>The Formation of the State of Oklahoma, 1803-1906</i> , by Marion Dargan	280
Lafferty, <i>The Lure of Kentucky: A Historical Guide Book</i> , by A. M. Stuckles ..	282
Johnson, <i>A Century of Wayne County, Kentucky, 1800-1900</i> , by Jonathan T. Dorris	283
Marshall and Evans, <i>They Found It In Natchez</i> , by John K. Bettersworth ..	284
Couper, <i>One Hundred Years at V. M. I., I and II</i> , by William M. Robinson, Jr.	285
Kentucky Writers' Project of the Work Projects Administration, <i>A Centennial History of the University of Louisville</i> , by Charles Edward Smith	286
Lockmiller, <i>History of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, 1889-1939</i> , by Florence E. Smith	288
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	289
Personal	289
Historical Societies	292
Bibliographical	293
<i>Contributors</i>	300

Confederate Medicine

BY GEORGE WORTHINGTON ADAMS

The Civil War was fought in the very last years of the medical middle ages. While the guns were firing throughout the South Pasteur was laying the groundwork for bacteriology, and within two years after the surrender of Lee, Lister was beginning the application of his aseptic method. Meanwhile, in America, physicians trained in the old attitudes were trying desperately to meet the gigantic problems of military medicine and surgery with such means as they could command. That they came nearer to success than any previous "doctors in uniform" is a fact that was lost sight of in the blaze of medical progress that came in the seventies and eighties.

To the southern medical profession the war meant not only an opportunity for patriotic service but an opportunity as well for some thirty-four hundred of its members¹ to take what amounted to a postgraduate course in medicine and surgery. One of the war's graduates, looking for a silver lining to the cloud of southern tragedy, wrote of the "incalculable advantage" of war service to the physician, and remarked that "he is more practically efficient and useful, at the bed side now, than ever before, and the whole country is now furnished with a medical corps which the war has thoroughly educated and reliably trained."²

The details as to just how well educated and how efficient the Con-

¹ A. A. Lyon, "Proceedings of the Association of Medical Officers of the Army and Navy of the Confederacy," in *Southern Practitioner* (Nashville, 1879-1918), XXXIII (1911), 414. See also, an earlier estimate in Joseph Jones, "The Medical Corps of the Confederate Army and Navy, 1861-65," in *Atlanta Medical and Surgical Journal* (Atlanta, 1855-1899), N. S., VII (1891), 348 ff.

² Edwin S. Gaillard, *The Medical and Surgical Lessons of the Late War* (Louisville, 1868), 4; Joseph Jones, *Medical and Surgical Memoirs*, 3 vols. (New Orleans, 1876-1890), I, v.

federate surgeons were can never be definitely known. The records of the medical department burned in the Richmond fire,³ leaving only some fragmentary statistics and the opinions of veterans and enemies on this point. The soldiers had been inclined to fear the doctor and his dreadful remedies,⁴ as many Americans of that period did.⁵ The enemy—as enemies will—tended to scoff.⁶ Dr. Samuel H. Stout, a prominent Confederate surgeon, wrote many years after the war that “no armies ever went to the field with a better educated corps of medical men.”⁷ Dr. Simon Baruch, later to attain fame as the founder of the New York Polyclinic Hospital and as the father of the renowned Bernard Baruch, testified to the thoroughness of the examination he had to pass to enter the service, but added, “before ever treating a sick person or even having lanced a boil and still under the age of twenty-two I was . . . put in charge of a battalion of 500 infantry, with only a hospital steward to assist me.”⁸ The facts seem to warrant the conclusion that the examining boards were uneven in their enforcement of standards.

Some aspects of professional advancement had been of rather slow

³ Samuel P. Moore, “Address of the President of the Association of Medical Officers of the Confederate States Army and Navy [1875],” in *Southern Practitioner*, XXXI (1909), 497.

⁴ James H. McNeilly, “Recollections from One, Who Though Not a Surgeon, Was With Them All the Time,” *ibid.*, XXII (1900), 418-19; John L. Dismukes, “Some Personal Experiences and Recollections of the Past,” *ibid.*, XXIV (1902), 493-95; Kate Cumming, *A Journal of Hospital Life in the Confederate Army of Tennessee* (Louisville, 1866), 96; *Personal Memoirs of John H. Brinton, Major and Surgeon U. S. V., 1861-1865* (New York, 1914), 59; J. Theodore Calhoun, “Offhand Sketches of an Army Surgeon’s Experiences During the Great Rebellion,” in *Medical and Surgical Reporter* (Philadelphia, 1858-1898), IX (1863), 279; Samuel H. Stout, “Some Facts of the History of the Organization of the Medical Service of the Confederate Armies and Hospitals,” in *Southern Practitioner*, XXV (1903), 29. See also, William H. Russell, *My Diary North and South*, 2 vols. (London, 1863), II, 33-34; Arthur C. Cole, *The Irrepressible Conflict, 1850-1865* (New York, 1934), 297.

⁵ Richard H. Shryock, *The Development of Modern Medicine* (Philadelphia, 1936), 54-55.

⁶ As typical examples, see Charles H. Rawson, “Diseases in the Army,” in *American Medical Times* (New York, 1860-1864), V (1862), 265-66; *The Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion*, 6 vols. (Washington, 1870-1888), *Medical History*, I, App., 259.

⁷ Samuel H. Stout, “An Address Concerning the History of the Medical Service in the Field and Hospitals of the Confederate Army and Department of Tennessee,” in *Southern Practitioner*, XXIV (1902), 437.

⁸ Simon Baruch, *Reminiscences of a Confederate Surgeon* ([New York], 1915), 1-2.

growth in the South. When the *New Orleans Medical and Surgical Journal* was founded in 1844 it was the only medical journal south of Louisville, and most of the South's medical schools had been started since that date.⁹ However, by 1861 other journals had appeared and state medical societies existed in all of the southern states except Florida, Arkansas, and Texas.¹⁰ Unfortunately, medical journalism and book publication suffered greatly during the war, and all of the journals were forced out of business by 1864.¹¹ The Confederate medical department, in trying to fill the gap, published a journal in 1864-1865 and authorized the publication of three books, only one of which, however, actually reached publication.¹² At the end of the war southern journals felt it necessary to publish résumés of what had been happening in the medical world outside. These articles ignored war subjects almost entirely, apparently because their readers were well abreast of military surgery.¹³

Being unable to read what others were doing, the Confederate surgeons gave their attention to observation and to reading papers to one another. The medical department sponsored a society at Richmond. Surgeons with the armies in the field organized dissection clubs to dissect Yankee cadavers and to discuss scientific topics.¹⁴

The greatest educational opportunity offered by the war was that of

⁹ *Southern Journal of Medical Sciences* (New Orleans, 1866-1867), I (1866), 188; Cole, *Irrepressible Conflict*, 51; F. R. Packard, *History of Medicine in the United States*, 2 vols. (New York, 1931), II, 789, 827.

¹⁰ Edward H. Clarke *et al.*, *A Century of American Medicine, 1776-1876* (Philadelphia, 1876), 344-46.

¹¹ "Revival of Medical Journalism," in *American Medical Times*, IX (1864), 9.

¹² Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 496. The journal was the *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, published at Richmond from January, 1864, through February, 1865. The most complete file is in the Army Medical Library, Washington, D. C.

¹³ See *Southern Journal of Medical Sciences*, I (1866); *Richmond Medical Journal* (Richmond, 1866-1911), I (1866), *passim*.

¹⁴ L. J. Wilson, *The Confederate Soldier* (Fayetteville, Ark., 1902), 171; Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 494 ff. Moore was surgeon general of the army. Cf. F. P. Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department; Modifications of Treatment Required in the Management of the Confederate Soldier, Dependent upon his Peculiar Moral and Physical Condition; with a Reference to Certain Points in Practice," in *Southern Medical and Surgical Journal* (Augusta, 1836-1839, 1845-1861, 1866-1867), Ser. III, Vol. I (1867), 273-74.

practicing in one of the enormous military hospitals of the time. These hospitals were spread far and wide over the country but reached their greatest size and highest development at Richmond, where the Chimborazo and the Winder each had seventy-eight hundred beds.¹⁵ In these great hospitals young medical students served as "medical stewards" and were given opportunities for clinical observation that few of them would ever have again.¹⁶ That the Richmond hospitals were very good and exceedingly light and clean was affirmed by the secretary of the United States Sanitary Commission who visited them in 1865.¹⁷ Alas, even the challenge of such opportunities was not enough to make some of the medical officers "laboratory-minded": the surgeon general was forced to scold his corps for their indifference to keeping proper scientific records.¹⁸

As soon as he took the field the new surgeon had to learn the stern conditions of military practice. These were, first, to learn how to get along without supplies and equipment, and, second, that the doctor could advise until exhausted, but the soldiers would do as they thought best about hygienic and sanitary matters.

As the Confederacy began life without any great store of medical supplies, and as the Washington government soon established the blockade and made such things contraband of war, there seemed only two alternatives open: to import supplies by blockade runner or to manufacture them. So long as the blockade could be run there was a minimum of supplies available¹⁹—munitions came first—but as the blockade grew tighter drug prices rose to appalling heights and new expedients

¹⁵ Edgar E. Hume, "Chimborazo Hospital, Confederate States Army—America's Largest Military Hospital," in *Military Surgeon* (Washington, 1891-), LXXV (1934), 156 ff. Major Hume contends that the 74,000 patients treated by this hospital entitle it to the title of "largest" in our military history. Cf. Alex G. Lane, "The Winder Hospital, Richmond, Va.," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXVI (1904), 37-38; S. E. Habersham, "Observations upon the Statistics of Chimborazo Hospital," in *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery* (Nashville, 1851-1920), N. S., I (1866), 416-28.

¹⁶ Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 494.

¹⁷ *Documents of United States Sanitary Commission*, No. 89 (Washington, 1865), 6-8.

¹⁸ *Confederate States Army, Special Orders*, 1862, No. 29 (June 25, 1862), in collection of original printed orders, Army Medical Library, Washington, D. C.

¹⁹ Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 496.

had to be tried. A regular commerce grew up with the North, in which southern women smuggled opium, quinine, and other precious things in the secret recesses of their ample Victorian clothing,²⁰ and dead horses and mules carted out of Memphis carried stored deep within them the drugs that meant anesthesia and health for Confederate soldiers.²¹ But the enemy tightened these avenues of entrance and the South had to turn to its fields and forests.

There was an old belief, still accepted by some, that within every country there grew plants which could heal the diseases of that country.²² Doctors began to get out their herbals, and the medical department established four manufacturing laboratories and published a pamphlet on useful plants.²³ The great search for *ersatz* remedies was on. The laboratories were highly successful with their castor oil and peanut oil, but efforts to grow opium in Georgia and North Carolina failed,²⁴ and the army doctors felt that the only important result of the whole experiment was to demonstrate the falsity of the herbalists' faith.²⁵ By the winter of 1864-1865 quinine pills cost \$1.00 apiece, "other pills" brought \$5.00 a dozen, morphine cost \$10.00 a drachm, and chloroform was beyond price.²⁶ Possibly as a result of the high price of chloroform Dr. Julian J. Chisholm of Charleston invented his chloroform "inhaler"—one of the few inventions of the war—a device

²⁰ C. Kendrick, "Indigenous Plants used by Southern People as Medicine During the War," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXXI (1909), 534-35; Seth C. Gordon, "The Attitude of the Women of the North and the South During and Since the War," in *War Papers Read Before the Commandery of the State of Maine, Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the U. S.*, 4 vols. (Portland, Me., 1898), IV, 230 ff., 246.

²¹ McNeilly, "Recollections," in *loc. cit.*, 419.

²² Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 13.

²³ Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 494-96; Herbert M. Nash, "Some Reminiscences of a Confederate Surgeon," in College of Physicians of Philadelphia, *Transactions* (Philadelphia, 1841-), Ser. III, Vol. XXVIII (1906), 134-35.

²⁴ Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 494-96. See also, W. T. Grant, "Indigenous Medicinal Plants," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 84-86; C. H. Tebault, "Confederate Resources," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXIV (1902), 48.

²⁵ Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 13.

²⁶ J. Jacobs, "Some of the Drug Conditions During the War between the States," in *Southern Medical Record* (Atlanta, 1871-1899), XXVIII (1898), 633; Ferdinand E. Daniel, *Recollections of a Rebel Surgeon* (Austin, 1899), 213.

which fitted directly to the nostrils of an operation case and made a little chloroform go a long way.²⁷

When the Confederate doctor went into action against disease his technique was simple. He asked the symptoms, he reflected, and he prescribed what tradition and his own experience said was good. If he were among the better educated he might have a stethoscope, and use percussion and auscultation, that is, would thump the patient's chest and listen. He would have no hypodermic syringe, and probably knew little or nothing about microscopes.²⁸ To the best of our knowledge Dr. Joseph Jones, later to shine as a medical light of New Orleans, was the only Confederate to use a clinical thermometer.²⁹

American medical theory was then in a peculiar transitional stage. Great leaders, working mainly in Europe, had been busy for the past two generations in bringing modern medicine to birth. The influence of the great Frenchmen, Marie-Francois-Xavier Bichat and Pierre-Charles-Alexander Louis, had pointed attention to diseased tissues as the seat of disease and to medical statistics as a valued means of evaluating treatments. But these advances, and many others, were slow in crossing the ocean and slow in meeting acceptance by American physicians. American medicine was divided into "sects" and "schools." "Botanics" who would have no truck with mineral medicines argued with "calomel doctors"; homeopaths who prescribed tiny doses decried allopaths who dosed heroically. New diseases had been discovered and new names had been given to old diseases, but as everything was in flux the medical nomenclature of the time presented many anomalies. Some com-

²⁷ *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Surgical History*, III, 889. The only other surgical invention the writer has discovered is the "inter-dental splint," invented late in the war by Dr. J. B. Bean, an Atlanta dentist. It was said to give very fine results in fractures of the maxillary bones. See E. N. Covey, "The Inter-Dental Splint," in *Richmond Medical Journal*, I (1866), 81.

²⁸ Mathew A. Reasoner, "The Development of the Medical Supply Service," in *Military Surgeon*, LXIII (1928), 4; J. C. Abernathy, "The Manual of Military Surgery for the Army of the Confederate States," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXIV (1902), 678.

²⁹ Joseph Jones, "Investigations upon the Nature, Causes, and Treatment of Hospital Gangrene, as It Prevailed in the Confederate Armies, 1861-1865," in Frank H. Hamilton (ed.), *Surgical Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion*, 2 vols. (New York, 1870-1871), II, 235, 236.

plaints were listed according to symptoms, others according to the seat of the disease, and still others according to their real or fancied cause.⁸⁰

The Confederate physician's attitude was most eclectic and his ideas on disease were extraordinarily confused, or they would be if he took seriously the official Confederate table of diseases. Hospital gangrene (probably a streptococcus infection) was not listed there until 1864, and then appeared with the local diseases of skin and tissue. "Traumatic erysipelas" (i.e., erysipelas following an injury) was listed with "gun-shot wounds, fractures, and military executions," while "idiopathic erysipelas" (erysipelas which seemed to be spontaneous) appeared as a "continued fever," a disease class "the seat of which was referred to the blood." Other complaints in the "Continued fever" category were typhoid, chicken pox, and scarlet fever. Joseph Jones, who called attention to these absurdities, remarked with scorn that "malaria is referred exclusively to the nervous system." Dysentery does not even appear on the list, although it was later credited with killing more men than enemy bullets.⁸¹ Dr. Jones, the most progressive physician of his nation, believed that typhoid, hospital gangrene, and typhus could arise spontaneously.⁸² In his careful investigation into hospital gangrene he used a microscope and discovered that "animalcules of simple organization, and endowed with active rotary motion" swarmed in gangrenous matter, but he reasoned that they had nothing to do with the gangrene because the same beings were to be found in any putrefying matter.⁸³ In the report on his investigations he quoted with approval the dictum of Sir Henry Holland that contagion may be by inoculation or contact, but that "in the great majority of instances" infections come from fomites thrown off by a diseased surface into the atmosphere.⁸⁴

Dr. M. H. Houston believed that cholera (an intestinal infection) was not contagious and that it was propagated by "reproduction of its

⁸⁰ The best account of this whole field is in Shryock, *Development of Modern Medicine*, Chaps. III-XIII, *passim*, especially Chaps. IX, X, XIII.

⁸¹ Jones, "Investigations upon the Nature, Causes, and Treatment of Hospital Gangrene," in *loc. cit.*, 173-74.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 241.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 265-66.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 165-68.

poison within the atmosphere."³⁵ Dr. Erasmus D. Fenner, the pillar of medical journalism in the deep South, announced in 1866 that plague, cholera, and yellow fever belonged to the same class and originated from similar causes.³⁶ Dr. D. M. Clay wrote in the same year that the symptoms of cholera "are those of a violent neurosis," and was willing to give bleeding a "cautious trial" as a cholera remedy.³⁷ Dr. F. P. Porcher felt that in cerebrospinal meningitis bleeding and blisters were the only hope.³⁸ But Dr. Edwin S. Gaillard assures us that bleeding as a therapeutic procedure went down in esteem during the war period.³⁹ Dr. John G. Westmoreland wrote that typhoid and malaria were not likely to be produced by the same locality.⁴⁰

A seemingly modern note, but possibly an indication of homeopathic influence, was sounded by Dr. Porcher when he told his generation that they gave too much medicine, that, in particular, they gave too much mercury, and that proper food of suitable quantity and quality was the principal agent in procuring a cure.⁴¹ Turpentine rated high as a remedy with many southern physicians, and one of them, as late as 1906, was sticking to his belief that it was especially valuable in malaria and typhoid.⁴²

The *Richmond Medical Journal* reported in 1866 the great success that Dr. H. Chalmer Miles was having in curing gonorrhea with purgatives and blisters.⁴³ Dr. J. Jacobs, the leading enthusiast in the use of native herbs, discovered that "*phytolacca*, or *poke*," was excellent in

³⁵ M. H. Houston, "Cholera," in *Richmond Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1866), 91, 105.

³⁶ Erasmus D. Fenner, "Remarks on the Sanitary Condition of the City of New Orleans During the Period of Federal Military Occupation," in *Southern Journal of the Medical Sciences*, I (1867), 28.

³⁷ D. M. Clay, "Pathology and Treatment of Cholera," *ibid.*, 627, 630-31.

³⁸ Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department," in *loc. cit.*, 272.

³⁹ Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 10.

⁴⁰ John G. Westmoreland, "Letter from Richmond," in *Atlanta Medical and Surgical Journal*, VII (1861), 6.

⁴¹ Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department," in *loc. cit.*, 259-61. He remarked that some doctors were giving their patients as much as two grains of calomel every two or three hours, a day or more at a time. See also, *ibid.*, 251-52, 271.

⁴² Nash, "Some Reminiscences," in *loc. cit.*, 135; Jacobs, "Some of the Drug Conditions During the War between the States," in *loc. cit.*, 628.

⁴³ *Richmond Medical Journal*, I (1866), 63.

cases of "chronic rheumatism, neuralgia, enlarged glands, scrofula, and syphilis." He also sang the praises of "nut gall, or ink ball," which was a destroyer of "syphilitic sores, warts, corns and ringworms," and which, when "properly weakened," was excellent in bowel diseases, and could "be used as an injection in gonorrhea, gleet, etc." "Silk weed root put in whiskey and drunk" along with pills of pine rosin and small pieces of blue vitriol would, according to Dr. Jacobs, "cure obstinate cases of gonorrhea."⁴⁴

But Dr. Jacobs was not typical, and the diseases which he thought his herbs would cure were not the major menaces which were destroying the manpower and crippling the military efficiency of the Confederacy. The great diseases were pneumonia, "camp fevers," malaria, and the dysenteries. Measles and scurvy, though not considered great killers, were each responsible for lowered resistance that opened the doors to numerous other maladies.⁴⁵

During one period of nineteen months, in 1862-1863, 17 per cent of the Confederate army had pneumonia, and the mortalities were appalling.⁴⁶ The usual idea of the time was that pneumonia was an "inflammation," and that the proper means of combating inflammation was bleeding. In the face of high mortalities the surgeons decided that war-time pneumonia was different. So the lancet and antimony were given up in favor of a "sustaining" treatment of liquor, opium, and quinine.⁴⁷ When the men continued to die in large numbers the mortality was

⁴⁴ Jacobs, "Some of the Drug Conditions During the War between the States," in *loc. cit.*, 627.

⁴⁵ Paul F. Eve, "Answers to Certain Questions Propounded by Prof. Charles A. Lee, M. D., Agent of the U. S. Sanitary Commission, Relative to the Health, etc., of the Late Southern Army," in *Nashville Journal of Medicine and Surgery*, N. S., 1 (1866), 17. See also, the various fragmentary statistics in *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, I-III, *passim*.

⁴⁶ Austin Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease, and to Camp Diseases; together with a Report of the Diseases, etc., among the Prisoners at Andersonville* (New York, 1867), 336; Joseph Jones, "Relations of Pneumonia and Malarial Fever: with practical observations upon the anti-periodic or abortive method of treating pneumonia," in *Southern Medical and Surgical Journal*, Ser. III, Vol. I (1866), 220-48; Dr. J. C. Edwards, "Pneumonia in the Confederate Army," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXXIII (1911), 478 ff.

⁴⁷ Daniel, *Recollections of a Rebel Surgeon*, 214.

sometimes laid to the poor quality of the whiskey available.⁴⁸ When drugs were wanting the pneumonia patient might be given "butterfly root and sanguinara," along with local applications of mustard seed or stramonium leaves.⁴⁹ Many years of bacteriological study had to intervene before the valuable serum treatment of our own time would be possible.

In the treatment of measles—a disease so widespread and so virulent that it has been called "the scourge of the Confederate Army"—the experience of wartime led to a strong belief in the value of open-air treatment as opposed to the hitherto standard practice of shutting the patient in a room in order that fresh air and breezes might not "drive the eruption in."⁵⁰

Although malaria was still attributed to "miasms," they knew a good many practical expedients to avoid it, such as building fires and staying to windward of stagnant water. Unfortunately, the movements of the armies seriously upset the balance between infection and resistance throughout the infested areas, with a high malaria incidence as the result.⁵¹ Quinine had been the malaria specific in the South for some years, but quinine was an imported drug and the supply situation went from bad to worse. Numerous substitute treatments were tried. The one that aroused the most interest and seemed to be of some benefit was that evolved at the Pettigrew hospital at Raleigh, which involved applications of turpentine to the abdomen a certain number of minutes

⁴⁸ Habersham, "Observations upon the Statistics of Chimborazo Hospital," in *loc. cit.*, 422. Dr. Porcher was especially vehement in denouncing the use of calomel and tartar emetic in pneumonia. See Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department," in *loc. cit.*, 283-84.

⁴⁹ Jacobs, "Some of the Drug Conditions During the War between the States," in *loc. cit.*, 627.

⁵⁰ Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 10-11; Benjamin W. Jones, *Under the Stars and Bars* (Richmond, 1909), 15; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion*, *Medical History*, III, 649.

⁵¹ Mark F. Boyd, *An Introduction to Malariology* (Cambridge, 1930), 10, 12; W. H. Taylor, "Some Experiences of a Confederate Assistant Surgeon," in College of Physicians of Philadelphia, *Transactions*, Ser. III, Vol. XXVIII (1906), 105; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion*, *Medical History*, III, 103-104; Samuel P. Day, *Down South; An Englishman's Experience*, 2 vols. (London, 1862), I, 132.

before an attack was due.⁵² Quinine, however, has remained the great malaria drug down to our own times.

More valuable were the experiments with quinine as a prophylactic; experiments made possible by the army statistical system and the controlled conditions of army life.⁵³ The results were encouraging, but of little immediate use in view of the inadequate supply of quinine. Large numbers of people dragged wearily through the war years with what was diagnosed as "chronic malarial poisoning." There is reason to think that many of these patients may have been in reality hookworm cases.⁵⁴

As the war went on it became trite to remark that whatever a man suffered from he had diarrhoea or dysentery in addition.⁵⁵ Differential diagnosis was so bad that the two terms became almost interchangeable, and in the absence of bacteriological examination any of the many diseases in which diarrhoea is a symptom might lead to assignment on the sick list under one heading or the other. Naturally, under such confusing conditions, both physicians and patients had widely varying ideas

⁵² "On the External Application of Oil of Turpentine as a Substitute for Quinine in Intermittent Fever," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 7-8; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, III, 187-89.

⁵³ Samuel Logan, "Prophylactic Effects of Quinine," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 81-83; S. S. Herrick, "Quinine as a Therapeutic Agent," in *American Medical Association, Transactions* (Philadelphia, 1848-1882), XX (1869), 618; Jones, *Medical and Surgical Memoirs*, II, 1117-27. For a modern view of the prophylactic value of quinine, see William N. Bispham, "Report of Malarial Control Fourth Corps Area," in *Military Surgeon*, LXXVIII (1936), 302-303.

⁵⁴ Charles W. Stiles, *Report upon the Prevalence and Geographic Distribution of Hookworm Disease in the United States*, Public Health and Marine Hospital Service of the United States, *Hygienic Laboratory Bulletin*, No. 10 (Washington, 1903), 32, 36. Stiles found a great many cases so misdiagnosed. The statement is made by the writer because of this and because the clinical pictures in a number of case histories look very much like hookworm. Stiles remarks that the disease can be traced in southern medical writings as far back as 1808. It is interesting to note that real malaria may sometimes have been confused with "Diarrhoea," as a persistent diarrhoea and other gastrointestinal symptoms may be malarial sequelae. See Nathan F. Kendall, "Malaria," in George M. Piersol (ed.), *The Cyclopedia of Medicine*, 14 vols. (Philadelphia, 1936), VIII, 523. The presence of certain symptoms, notably a peculiar "bronzed integument" covering the body in a particular pattern, in the description of "chronic malarial poisoning" given by a northern surgeon, leads the writer to suspect that this disease might also be confused with pellagra. See Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease*, 122-23.

⁵⁵ Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department," in *loc. cit.*, 277. For an analysis of the statistics on these diseases in the Confederate Army, see *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, II, 27 ff.

on the cause of the "disease,"⁵⁶ and naturally they had equally varying ideas on therapeutics. Many of the treatments were highly complicated and were based on long rationalizations, but in general they could be divided into those which involved belief in purges and those which made use of intestinal astringents.⁵⁷ A good idea of the simple nature of the practice of many army physicians can be had by a glance at a paragraph by Dr. William H. Taylor. At morning sick call, he wrote, diagnosis was rapidly made, usually by intuition, and treatment was with such drugs as we chanced to have in the knapsack and were easiest to obtain. . . . On the march my own practice was still further simplified, and was, in fact, reduced to the lowest terms. In one pocket of my trousers I had a ball of blue mass [a mercurial preparation], in another a ball of opium [an astringent]. All complainants were asked the same question, "How are your bowels?" If they were open, I administered a plug of opium; if they were shut I gave a plug of blue mass.⁵⁸

There was considerable argument as to whether the "camp fever" which bedeviled the army was typhoid or some vague newcomer. The disputants could arrive at no definite decision, but the modern student is inclined to suspect that the paratyphoids, then unknown, made the variant cases whose presence confused the doctors.⁵⁹

⁵⁶ Cf. Eve, "Answers to Certain Questions," in *loc. cit.*, 18; Frank L. Richardson, "War As I Saw It, 1861-1865," in *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (New Orleans, 1917-), VI (1923), 228.

⁵⁷ Bedford Brown, "Personal Experience in Observing the Results of Good and Bad Sanitation in the Confederate States Army," in *Transactions of the Pan-American Medical Congress* (Washington, 1893), Pt. I, 734; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, II, *passim*, but especially pp. 348 ff., 483 ff., 654 ff., and 735 ff. See also, *Rules for Preserving the Health of the Soldier*, United States Sanitary Commission, *Document No. 17* (n. p., 1861), 4-6; "Report of the 1900 Meeting of the Association of Medical Officers of the Confederacy," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXII (1900), 299; McNeilly, "Recollections," in *loc. cit.*, 420; Porcher, "Suggestions Made to the Medical Department," in *loc. cit.*, 281; Dr. Wilshire, "Treatment of Chronic Dysentery with Ipecacuanha," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 223. This is a reprint of an English article. For a scholarly history of dysentery and its treatment, see *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, II, 735 ff. Jacobs, "Some of the Drug Conditions During the War between the States," in *loc. cit.*, 636-37, describes some of the more eccentric remedies. One of these was the "Diseremus pill," made of equal parts of red pepper and crude rosin.

⁵⁸ Taylor, "Some Experiences of a Confederate Assistant Surgeon," in *loc. cit.*, 105.

⁵⁹ L. Formento, *Notes and Observations on Army Surgery* (New Orleans, 1863), 14-15; Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 8; J. R. Buist, "Some Items of My Medical and

There was only a suspicion that typhoid might be spread by human excreta, and the usual dietetic and atmospheric theories on the cause of "diarrhoea" could not be made to square with such an idea. But as the war went on observation taught the medical men that there was a positive correlation between the cleanliness of a camp and the figures of its intestinal disease rates.⁶⁰

The camps of the Confederate army were usually clean to the outward eye,⁶¹ but the latrines provided were neither well planned⁶² nor adequately cared for. Large numbers of the more ignorant enlisted men, especially those from rural regions, seem never to have been properly housebroken, and stubbornly resisted the efforts of their officers to persuade them to use even these inadequate facilities.⁶³

As vaccination was introduced in America in 1800, it is with some surprise that we find smallpox an active menace sixty years later.⁶⁴ This

Surgical Experience in the Confederate Army," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXV (1903), 574; Jones, "Investigations upon the Diseases of the Federal Prisoners Confined in Camp Sumpter, Andersonville, Ga., Instituted with a View to Illustrate Chiefly the Origin and Cause of Hospital Gangrene, the Relations of Continued and Malarial Fevers, and the Pathology of Camp Diarrhoea and Dysentery," in Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease*, 348 ff.

⁶⁰ The British medical profession was carrying on a controversy on the part played by human excrement in spreading typhoid. See *Medical and Surgical Reporter*, XI (1864), 281-83; Buist, "Some Items in My Medical and Surgical Experience," in *loc. cit.*, 577-78; Jones, "Investigations upon the Nature, Causes, and Treatment of Hospital Gangrene," in Hamilton (ed.), *Surgical Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion*, II, 380; Brown, "Personal Experience in Observing the Results of Good and Bad Sanitation," in *loc. cit.*, 733.

⁶¹ Taylor, "Some Experiences of a Confederate Assistant Surgeon," in *loc. cit.*, 104.

⁶² See instructions and regulations in Julian J. Chisholm, *A Manual of Military Surgery, for the Use of Surgeons in the Confederate States Army* (Richmond, 1864), 54; *Regulations for the Medical Department of the Confederate States Army* (Richmond, 1862), 6, 9. These give the ideal, and the ideal was neither adequate by modern standards nor, apparently, was it carried out. See *post*, n. 63.

⁶³ Eve, "Answers to Certain Questions," in *loc. cit.*, 16, 18; H. V. Redfield, "Characteristics of the Armies," in *The Annals of the War, Written by Leading Participants, North and South, Originally published in the Philadelphia Weekly Times* (Philadelphia, 1879), 362; Brown, "Personal Experience in Observing the Results of Good and Bad Sanitation," in *loc. cit.*, 730-31, 733; Russell, *My Diary North and South*, I, 151-52; Worthington C. Ford (ed.), *War Letters, 1862-1865, of John Chapman Gray, Major, Judge Advocate, and John Codman Ropes, Historian of the War* (New York, 1927), 380; Chisholm, *Manual of Military Surgery*, 2-3, 7; Douglas S. Freeman, *R. E. Lee; A Biography*, 4 vols. (New York, 1934-1935), I, 556-61.

⁶⁴ Formento, *Notes and Observations*, 16; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, III, 627 ff.

condition was due not so much to leaving men unvaccinated as to bad vaccination technique and impure vaccine. The usual procedure was to use the crust of one vaccination as vaccine for as many as two hundred new vaccinations.⁶⁵ It became a fad in the army—pursued in violation of orders—for the soldiers to vaccinate one another, using rusty knives or whatever instrument was handy. On many thousands of men large and noisome ulcers appeared at the point of vaccination, starting a drawn-out controversy—never entirely settled to everyone's satisfaction—as to whether these sores were syphilitic and due to syphilitic infection in the persons from whom the crusts had been taken. In at least some of these cases the syphilitic theory was probably correct.⁶⁶ It was felt at the time that in some cases the sores were due to the incipient scurvy which afflicted so many men in the latter years of the war and which made difficult the healing of so many gunshot wounds.⁶⁷

The surgeons of the day were still in the period of "laudable pus." They believed that supuration was a normal and necessary part of the mechanism of tissue repair and were astonished when in a few cases wounds healed without it.⁶⁸ They thought a bare finger was the best probe; they operated in dirty uniforms; they used the same marine sponge to swab out the wounds of countless men; they re-used linen

⁶⁵ *Circular of the Surgeon General, October 16, 1863, in Special Orders, Confederate States Army, 1863* (Army Medical Library, Washington). Moore, "Address," in *loc. cit.*, 497, describes his unsuccessful attempts to produce cow vaccine in the South.

⁶⁶ *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, III, 638 ff., sums up the whole controversy. See also, O. Kratz, "On Vaccination and Various Disease," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 104; Edwin E. Newton, "The Evolution of Medicine and Surgery," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXXIII (1911), 367; Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 11. J. T. Gilmore, "Spurious Vaccination in the Confederate States Army," in *St. Louis Medical Reporter* (St. Louis, 1866-1869), III (1868), 465 ff., and Eve, "Answers to Certain Questions," in *loc. cit.*, 20, both tell an instance of an infected vaccine being traced to material supplied by a Georgia prostitute, resident in a brothel.

⁶⁷ Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease*, 505; *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, III, 624; Eve, "Answers to Certain Questions," in *loc. cit.*, 16; Gaillard, *Medical and Surgical Lessons*, 11.

⁶⁸ Chisholm, *Manual of Military Surgery*, 249-50; John H. Bennett, "Treatment of Inflammation," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 142-43; Middleton Michel, "Healing of Gun-Shot Wounds by First Intention," *ibid.*, 99-102; Hamilton (ed.), *Surgical Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion*, II, 553-55. See also, Daniel, *Recollections*, 206 ff.

dressings; they meddled with wounds and thus made bad matters worse. If a knife dropped to the floor during an operation they would pick it up, rinse it in tap water, and continue the operation.⁶⁹ Far from being surprised at their large mortalities,⁷⁰ we should marvel that a majority of their operation cases recovered.

It is somewhat of a surprise to find that a number of antiseptics were in use in the sixties, but they were applied after the infection was well under way in a vain effort to lock the barn door after the horse was stolen.⁷¹ It should be noted, though, that the redoubtable Joseph Jones made a practice of painting the cuts and abrasions on his hands with iodine, and advised others to follow his example.⁷² In 1863 a group of Confederate surgeons who had entirely exhausted their supply of dressings made the accidental discovery that if maggots were left in a wound—instead of carefully picked out, as was the common practice,—they would clean out all infection and the patient would be miraculously cured.⁷³ In this they anticipated by almost seventy years the larval therapy technique of the surgeons of the 1930's.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ The best description of the surgical sins of the military operators of the time is by a Union surgeon. See William W. Keen, "Military Surgery in 1861 and in 1918," in *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences* (Philadelphia, 1890-), LXXX (1918), 14. For similar Confederate material, see C. H. Tebault, "Hospitals of the Confederacy," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXIV (1902), 503; Hamilton (ed.), *Surgical Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion*, 149, 296, 379, 507; Daniel, *Recollections*, 207-209; Buist, "Some Items of My Medical and Surgical Experience," in *loc. cit.*, 581.

⁷⁰ Cf. statistical material in "Amputation, Disarticulation and Resection Statistics of the Confederate States Army," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 77-78.

⁷¹ Hamilton (ed.), *Surgical Memoirs of the War of the Rebellion*, II, 553; Tebault, "Hospitals of the Confederacy," in *loc. cit.*, 503-505; Hargrave Hinkley, "Treatment of Hospital Gangrene," in *Confederate States Medical and Surgical Journal*, I (1864), 131-32.

⁷² Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease*, 473 n. Iodine seems to have been first used in 1855 "to counteract the effects of certain animal poisons" by Professor Daniel Brainard, in Chicago. It was used in vapor form. See MS. by Dr. C. W. Ellinwood, in United States Sanitary Commission Archives, Box 18, Doc. 1476 (New York Public Library).

⁷³ John R. MacKenzie, "Hospital Gangrene," in *Southern Practitioner*, XXIII (1901), 55-56, 440-42; Flint (ed.), *Contributions Relating to the Causation and Prevention of Disease*, 521. The horror with which the surgeons of the day regarded maggot-infested wounds is expressed in Martha L. Sternberg, *George M. Sternberg, A Biography* (Chicago, 1920), 6.

⁷⁴ For recent developments, see Grover C. Weil *et al.*, "The Cultivation and Sterilization of the Fly Larva or Maggot," in *West Virginia Medical Journal* (Huntington, 1906-),

The pitiful aspect of Confederate medicine is that with all their limitations of knowledge, limitations common to the whole medical profession of the time, the army doctors could have saved so many more men if only circumstances had not combined against them. A hundred and fifty thousand southern soldiers are supposed to have died of disease and only fifty thousand to have been killed by the enemy.⁷⁵ These sick men died, many of them, as victims of conditions over which the medical profession had no control. They died because of the lowered resistance brought about by months and years of short rations lacking in vitamins. They died because of exposure, most of which was necessary if a war was to be fought, but much of which was made fatal by inadequate issue of blankets and clothing. They died because, for all their gallantry as fighters, they could not be made to realize that personal and camp cleanliness are high among the military virtues. The medical theory and the medical practice of the time were both faulty, but they were both good enough to have saved perhaps half the lives lost had the fates been kinder.

XXVII (1931), 458 ff.; Morris A. Slocum *et al.*, "Investigation into the Modes of Action of Blow Fly Maggots in the Treatment of Chronic Osteomyelitis," in *Pennsylvania Medical Journal* (Harrisburg, 1897-), XXXVI (1933), 570 ff.

⁷⁵ *Medical and Surgical History of the War of the Rebellion, Medical History*, III, 1-3. This is the computation of Dr. Joseph Jones. It is said to have been considered correct by the former Adjutant and Inspector General of the Confederate army.

Indebted Railroads—A Problem of Reconstruction

BY E. G. CAMPBELL

Before the close of the Civil War in 1865 the Union government was operating thousands of miles of railroad, and had acquired a proportionate supply of rolling stock and shops. In the vicinity of Washington a few miles of track belonging to Union sympathizers had been taken over to achieve greater efficiency, but most of the trackage was situated in the South Atlantic states and in the territory around Nashville, and was owned by companies which had been aiding the Confederate cause before Union victories brought them within the Federal lines.

Under the direction of General Daniel C. McCallum the military authorities had welded together a transportation system of hitherto unparalleled size, which was characterized by remarkable efficiency. Armies at the front had been supplied; the wounded had been transported from the war zone to hospitals in the rear; railway gun mounts had shelled Richmond. But despite general acknowledgment that the government administration of the roads had been wholly successful, as the Confederate armies disbanded and peace again prevailed in the border states, the railways were turned back to their former owners.

Few of them, however, were prepared to operate their property, for treasuries were empty of cash. Reserves had been invested in Confederate securities, and income had been almost nil for four years. At first the companies had been used almost exclusively by the southern government, which could ill afford to pay except with its own bonds; later they had been operated by the Union armies, which had assumed complete control. Furthermore, these railroads were almost completely

without equipment. Rolling stock had been worn out by the strain of transporting Confederate troops and supplies at a time when the Union blockade cut off the materials necessary for adequate repairs; and the Federal government had restocked the roads with its own property.

Lacking both cash and credit, the southern railway companies could quickly resume private operation only if the government came to the rescue and transferred to them the equipment already in use on the roads. Under these circumstances President Andrew Johnson issued executive orders on August 8 and October 14, 1865, providing for the sale of rolling stock and shops to the companies upon terms which would delay payments until prosperity should have returned to the ravaged districts of the South.¹

The companies agreed to buy the property they needed at a price to be set by a board of appraisers appointed by the government. The board which was appointed by Major General George H. Thomas consisted of three experienced railroad men and two officers of the Engineer Corps: Albert Fink, then superintendent and later president of the Louisville and Nashville; Walter McQueen, superintendent of the Schenectady Locomotive Works; John G. Farnsworth of Indiana; Brevet Major General Zealous B. Tower; and Colonel William E. Merrill. This board carefully examined and appraised all the property, and no requests from the railroads were considered until its labors had been concluded.²

The terms under which the property was then transferred were relatively simple: the companies were to pay for it in twenty-four equal monthly installments, with interest at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum on the unpaid balance.³ In addition, each company's earnings from postal service and from the transportation of troops and government supplies were to be credited towards the liquidation of its indebtedness.

¹ *Report on Southern Railroads, House Executive Document*, No. 73, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 3-4.

² Montgomery C. Meigs to William W. Belknap, April 18, 1870, IV, 69-78, *Indebted Railroad Letterbooks*, Quartermaster General's Office, Division of War Department Archives, in *The National Archives*. All correspondence cited in this study is in this collection.

³ Daniel H. Rucker to William G. Brownlow, February 18, 1868, I, 116-18.

The rates for postal service had been set by the Post Office Department under authority from Congress; and the companies agreed to accept the same rates for passenger and freight transportation as were then in effect for northern railroads.⁴

Within a few weeks fifty companies arranged to buy equipment valued at \$5,627,732.89.⁵ Although there were numerous controversies over the form of the bonds and other technical details, transfers took place with a minimum of friction and disturbance. On the day appointed for the change from government to private operation, in many cases not a single train was delayed and incoming trains running at the time of transfer came in on account of the government while outgoing trains were leaving on account of the companies.⁶

This was an auspicious start, but it became apparent within a short time that the transaction would not be completed without a long and arduous struggle on the part of the government to collect the money due. By 1870, five years after the transfer and three years after the debts were supposed to have been paid in full, twenty-three companies, including all except two of those in the Atlantic states, had paid, but the twenty-five roads in the Southwest were almost hopelessly behind in their payments.⁷

Although the companies had agreed to the specific provision that all payments were to be made within two years, the Quartermaster Department of the army, which was charged with the task of collecting the money, had been forced to adopt a more liberal policy. When a company had asked for an extension of time on the plea that some temporary condition prevented payment, the request had been granted, and no action had been taken if the road remained delinquent in its payments. But gradually General James J. Dana, the officer in charge

⁴ Meigs to Belknap, April 18, 1870, IV, 69-78.

⁵ Most of these roads were located in the devastated regions of Tennessee and Virginia, although a few were in states farther south. *Report of the Quartermaster General, 1876* (Washington, 1876), 125-26.

⁶ *Letter from Brevet Colonel F. J. Crilly . . . to the Quartermaster General of the United States Army* [Marshall I. Ludington], June 9, 1870, with *Accompanying Papers* (pamphlet, n. p., n. d.).

⁷ *In the Matter of Southern Railroads, A Brief* (printed pamphlet, n. p., n. d.).

of indebted railroad affairs, became less obliging in his attitude. By the summer of 1868 he believed that the government would have to take a much more severe tone if companies "abundantly able to comply with the terms of the extension last granted" were ever to pay their just debts. He earnestly recommended that the War Department take measures to assure a rigid enforcement of payments, and thought that the time had passed for granting any more indulgences similar to those hitherto so generously conceded.⁸

At no time did the government manifest any "desire to crush" the companies; General Dana simply wanted to secure the payment of the claims within a reasonable time.⁹ In 1870 Quartermaster General Meigs could very fairly report that "the War Department has constantly sought not to be oppressive to these railroads" and that it had granted extensions of time to every company showing a disposition to meet its obligations.¹⁰

At the end of the war many of the companies were in such poor condition, both financially and physically, that they could not hope to begin payments for several years, but the difficulties Dana encountered in his efforts to collect from these companies were simple compared to those involved in the relations with the companies which did not want to pay, such as the Nashville and Decatur. With a main line extending from Nashville to Decatur, Alabama, and several small branch lines, the company had purchased \$341,006.88 of army equipment. Until May, 1866, payments were made promptly.¹¹ Dana thought that the directors had "generally evinced a desire to carry out their agreement with the United States in good faith," and recommended that their first requests for extensions be granted. But in June, 1869, a statement by President James W. Sloss that it was "utterly out of their power not only to resume the payment of monthly installments, but also to continue the prompt payment of monthly interest for the coming year," so surprised Dana that he sent John B. Van Dyne to investigate the

⁸ James J. Dana to Meigs, June 19, 1868, II, 778-80.

⁹ *Id.* to Lewis McKenzie, June 3, 1868, IV, 198-99.

¹⁰ *Report of the Quartermaster General, 1870* (Washington, 1870), 10-11.

¹¹ *House Executive Document*, No. 73, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 10-12.

situation. Van Dyne was unable to share the President's pessimistic view, and he reported that the company could easily pay, if it were so disposed, at least one half of the amount of the required monthly payment.¹²

The subsequent refusal to approve the company's application for another extension¹³ marked the beginning of a sharp struggle. President Sloss asked Representative Samuel M. Arnell to intercede, and Arnell promptly wrote Dana that he knew of his own experience that the Nashville and Decatur was not in a condition to pay. In 1865 and 1866 "as a director, on the part of the State of Tennessee to look after her interests," he had become "thoroughly acquainted with its condition, actual and prospective," and since then he had kept in close touch with the road's management. Furthermore, he charged, the report upon which the Secretary of War's opinion had been based, that by Van Dyne, had been made by a discharged employee of the Nashville and Decatur whose prejudices against the road were sufficient to render him entirely unfit to report on its business.¹⁴ The Secretary of War replied, through General Dana, that no change in his former decision would be made,¹⁵ and the Quartermaster Department continued its efforts to collect the debt.

By this effort to invoke political aid, however, the Nashville and Decatur merged its problems with those of a number of other companies which manifested no desire to pay their debts.¹⁶ For the most part they simply ignored all the efforts to collect what was due the government, and for his pains Dana was made the object of endless petty protests. Officials of the Memphis and Little Rock, when they could find no better reason for their refusal to pay, wrote to Secretary of War William W. Belknap, "as a director," calling his attention to their troubles, and expressing the hope that he would give the matter his immediate attention. An enclosed petition declared that the Quarter-

¹² Dana to Meigs, June 7, 1869, IV, 253-55.

¹³ *Id.* to Samuel R. Hamill, June 11, 1869, IV, 292-93.

¹⁴ Copy, Samuel M. Arnell to Dana, June 21, 1869, IV, 306-308.

¹⁵ Dana to Arnell, July 12, 1869, IV, 364-65.

¹⁶ *Report of the Quartermaster General, 1870*, pp. 10-11.

master Department had been guilty of illegal and arbitrary conduct in dealing with the indebted roads. Quartermaster General Meigs answered by pointing out that "all these acts complained of were done simply in endeavoring to carry out the orders of the President and Secretary of War and that every move of any importance was taken after consultation with and by express authority or order of the Secretary of War for the time being." He wearily added that the company was in the position of a debtor having failed to pay his debt assailing the officers of the government for their efforts to collect it.¹⁷

Most annoying of all were the tactics of Dana's former assistant, Brevet Colonel Samuel R. Hamill, who had left the army to become attorney for several of the indebted railroads. He seemed to delight in going out of his way to antagonize his former chief. Although Dana assured Meigs that the proper officers of the companies were regularly furnished whatever information they wished about their accounts, Hamill demanded that he be furnished with a monthly statement for each company he represented. Dana complained that his office was already overtaxed with work, and that to comply with all of Hamill's suggestions would necessitate the employment of an additional clerical force, or compel the neglect of other and current work of the office. The business was being conducted in the same manner as heretofore, and no complaints had reached him except from Hamill. It seemed "rather late for such complaints, particularly as the business was conducted without them, until the advent of Mr. Hamill."¹⁸ And in any event, he had not been authorized to approve of any discussions of net earnings which might be applied to the liquidation of the debts, nor of any other related controversies. His instructions only permitted him to insist upon the payment of the indebtedness on the terms last granted.¹⁹

Dana deeply resented Hamill's characterization of his methods as a "high-handed and arbitrary ex parte process of settlement of the indebtedness, and of matters having reference to it," and he asserted in

¹⁷ Meigs to Belknap, June 17, 1870, VI, 245-47.

¹⁸ Dana to Meigs, June 2, 1869, IV, 232-35.

¹⁹ *Id.* to Michael Burns, March 27, 1868, II, 346-47.

rebuttal that since Hamill had been acting as the attorney for the companies less money had been received from them than previously. And much time which might have been usefully employed had been devoted to replying to the attorney's garrulous letters. Since the enclosed letter was not referred to the War Department for report, he suggested that it be allowed to go on file without further action.²⁰ The effort to silence Hamill by ignoring him very soon proved a failure, and in the following autumn Dana tried another method. Hamill's next request for detailed monthly statements was answered with the curt statement that "it cannot be complied with."²¹

Another continuing source of controversy was the method by which the railroad companies should receive credit for their earnings from carrying mail. As early as October, 1867, the East Tennessee and Georgia had protested that it was entitled to interest monthly at the rate of $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent per annum since it was required to make monthly payments on its debt and pay that rate of interest. Turn about seemed fair play; if the government did not credit its earnings promptly, the government should pay the same interest that the company paid. The government was proving a very slow-paying customer, but Dana pointed out that if the money were retained by the Post Office Department beyond the term allowed by law for its payment, it was through no fault of his office. All sums were credited as soon as they were received. On the other hand, the postal authorities were forbidden by law to remit the warrants to the Quartermaster until the company had sent its vouchers to the Quartermaster, and he had forwarded them to the Treasury. Failure to send in vouchers promptly had caused delays, and company officials should see that the fault for accounts not being promptly paid was with the companies, and not with the government.²²

The Quartermaster Department credited a company with the amount allowed by the Post Office Department as of the date of the warrant issued by the Postmaster General on the Treasury of the United States. This procedure seemed eminently fair because it was at this date, or

²⁰ *Id.* to Meigs, June 2, 1869, IV, 232-35.

²¹ *Id.* to Hamill, October 20, 1869, IV, 751.

²² *Id.* to Thomas R. Calloway, October 4, 1867, I, 212-14.

certainly not earlier, that the company would have realized the payment of the postal dues if paid directly to them. On the other hand, at this date, and certainly not earlier, the Quartermaster Department received the money; it could not get it sooner, and there was no authority for crediting the company with it before it was received. Finally, it seemed to Dana, the adoption of any different rule would have been a violation of the laws of Congress, of the rules of the Post Office Department, and of the contracts entered into by the companies for carrying the mail.²³

Despite the cogency of these arguments, the cumbersome procedure continued to be a source of altercation. Dana was perfectly willing that the companies should have the benefit of everything to which they were properly entitled, and which they might claim, when it worked no injustice to the government, but he demanded authorization for his actions. He would not attempt to go beyond the law.²⁴ Nevertheless, he was unable to persuade the companies to forward their vouchers promptly. By February, 1871, one company was three years behind, and two others had sent in no vouchers for more than a year.²⁵

The controversies over procedure were of comparatively minor importance, however. At best the companies only hoped thereby to delay the final reckoning long enough to permit them to bring effective political pressure on Congress. An early triumph had been registered in November, 1867, when President Johnson had ordered Major General Thomas, then in charge of the matter, "to suspend action against all the railroad companies in Tennessee for non-payment of indebtedness to the United States until the examination into their affairs by the Congressional Committee shall have taken place, and until further orders from this department." General Dana asked whether the order was meant to suspend all collections and calls upon the companies for payment, or simply the enforcement of the penalties provided in the bond, and learned that it was intended to suspend the enforcement of the penalties, not the collections and calls.²⁶

²³ *Id.* to Reader W. Clarke, October 19, 1869, IV, 745-50.

²⁴ *Id.* to John J. Martin, October 21, 1870, VI, 494-98.

²⁵ *Id.* to *id.*, February 8, 1871, X, 73-77.

²⁶ *Id.* to Meigs, June 16, 1868, II, 760-65.

Without the power to do more than beg and cajole, the Quartermaster Department experienced little success in its efforts to collect from the recalcitrant companies. They were determined not to pay until they had exhausted every recourse. Their arguments against paying were essentially threefold: they denied the contention that the debt to the United States took precedence over any and all other debts; they claimed that they should be compensated for the use of their roads by the Union armies during the war; and they argued that the property had been overvalued when it was sold to them and that the sales were illegal.

The altercation over the priority of claims arose because the Tennessee railroad companies declared they could not make payments in money to the Federal government and at the same time provide for the payment of interest becoming due semiannually to the state on account of aid granted them in the construction and equipment of their roads.²⁷ The lien held by the state originated in the aid granted the roads before the Civil War, and had been increased by subscriptions to the bonded debt of the Confederacy, which had been endorsed by the state of Tennessee.²⁸

General Dana invariably insisted that their debt to the United States came first and that he recognized no claim on the road or property prior to that of the government.²⁹ President Michael Burns of the Nashville and Chattanooga asserted that the payment of interest to the state was provided for in the orders under which the railroad materials were originally sold, because "the State had the first lien upon the road." Dana at once corrected him. The only provision for the payments due the state of Tennessee was that all railroads in the state were required to pay any arrearages of interest on bonds issued to them by the state prior to the war before any dividends might be declared. Dana curtly added that he was "instructed to say that this has no reference what-

²⁷ *Id.* to Rucker, May 6, 1868, II, 605-19. Only the Tennessee companies faced this problem, apparently because no other state had granted aid under quite such stringent conditions.

²⁸ *Id.* to Burns, March 6, 1868, II, 234-38.

²⁹ *Id.* to Rucker, May 6, 1868, II, 605-19.

ever to this claim of the United States for property sold to the railroad companies."³⁰

Again and again he repeated that "payment of interest on the State bonds of Tennessee which were issued for the benefit of those railways will not be permitted before the terms of payment to the United States" had been fulfilled,³¹ but the companies just as stubbornly insisted that they must pay the interest first. Actually they were faced with a dilemma which could be solved only by a court decision: they had been notified by the governor of Tennessee that unless the interest due the state was punctually paid as it fell due, a receiver would be placed in charge of their roads; but if they paid the state first, the Quartermaster Department threatened to take over the roads.³²

The state's claim was based on the wording of its lien, which provided that the companies pay interest before any other obligation they might at any time assume.³³ General Dana and his successors constantly maintained that since the roads were captured while they were engaged in giving aid and comfort to the enemy, title to them had become vested absolutely in the United States government. The fact that after the close of hostilities the government had very generously returned the lines to their former owners did not alter these facts, and the government had been justified in imposing any conditions it chose as a prerequisite to returning them.

In the final analysis the controversy over priority depended upon the fact of capture, and upon the same fact depended the claim of the companies to compensation for use of their roads by Union armies during the war. Late in 1868 officials of the Nashville and Chattanooga had even arrived at the very satisfying conclusion that the government owed them money. They had purchased \$1,566,551.73 worth of property in 1865. But since much of the property purchased by the company belonged either to itself, or to other corporations or individuals, and the property had been grossly overvalued before it was sold, one half of

³⁰ *Id.* to Burns, March 6, 1868, II, 234-38.

³¹ *Id.* to Hamill, July 10, 1868, II, 891-92.

³² *Id.* to Rucker, May 6, 1868, II, 605-19.

³³ *Ibid.*

the face value of the debt, \$757,115.03, would be a fair sum to allow the government for the property. Then, the government had sold it \$72,927.00 worth of iron belonging to the company, so this much of the debt should be canceled. In addition, the company should receive credit for the amount received by the government from passenger and freight transported over the road in addition to government troops and supplies, which amounted to \$632,910.72. Finally, the company had paid in cash and transportation credits \$265,000.00. Thus, President Edmund W. Cole pointed out, the government owed the company more than \$100,000.00. At the same time General Dana, using somewhat different figures, kept plaguing the company to make some payment on what he considered a debt of \$1,613,508.30 to the government.³⁴

But regardless of the amounts of the debts, the companies asserted that the bonds given to the government were not binding, and that the transactions had been illegal. The claim of the government, they argued, rested "upon a contract, and if litigated, the law of contracts must prevail, not only as to the company itself, but as to third parties"; since the contract was in violation of the charter of the company, it was therefore void.³⁵

This reasoning depended upon two further contentions: the president of a road had no power to execute a contract of such magnitude without a vote of the stockholders;³⁶ and the companies alleged that they were compelled to take the property, which they did not want, for fear of not getting possession of their roads at all.³⁷

On the other hand, the Quartermaster Department pointed to actions such as that of the Board of Directors of the Nashville and Chattanooga on December 9, 1865, when it resolved that "we authorize M. Burns, president, to settle the matter of accounts with the United States government as he thinks best, and give such bonds as he and the executive committee may agree on, and that this board authorize him to sign the same, and use the corporate seal of the company in signing." As to the

³⁴ Dana to Meigs, December 18, 1868, III, 564-78.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

³⁶ *House Report*, No. 78, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 410.

³⁷ *In the Matter of Southern Railroad*, 3-4.

alleged compulsion, the Quartermaster officers asserted that the companies had stumbled over each other in their anxiety to get the railroad materials, and that the allegation was "false in every particular."³⁸

At the very least, the companies seem to have made the purchases of railway materials with unspoken reservations, if not definitely in bad faith. Railroad officials later claimed that they had feared the government would refuse to return the roads if they objected, and yet at the same time they asserted they had realized the contracts were not binding and had been convinced they would never have to pay. A strangely beneficent government would never insist that its debtors pay for what they bought.

President Cole of the Nashville and Chattanooga claimed that "the property was purchased by his predecessor in office, Mr. Burns, in the belief that it would never have to be paid for; that the company would be allowed as an offset, the amount received by the government during the war, for the transportation of passengers and freight over the road, and that the amount for which the bond was given would be cancelled, by an allowance to the company of a liberal amount for the use of the property."³⁹ Anson Nelson, one of the directors in 1865, testified that General Thomas had assured him that the government would treat them "kindly," and that there was no reason for them to expect any particular trouble on the subject, "though he could give us no advice as commander of the department, and only gave us his individual opinion." Cole himself had favored the purchase by the company simply because of his firm conviction that the government would allow the company compensation for the use of the road during the war "as a matter of justice to the stockholders." Otherwise, he asserted, he never would have voted for the purchase.⁴⁰

Quartermaster General Meigs's testimony seemed to lend some credence to these assertions. He had "hoped the States would be soon restored to their original condition in the Union," and he "thought it likely that if they made application to Congress they [the companies]

³⁸ *Letter from Brevet Colonel F. J. Crilly . . . June 9, 1870.*

³⁹ Dana to Meigs, December 18, 1868, III, 564-78.

⁴⁰ *House Report*, No. 78, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., 410.

would be treated liberally and might even be eventually released from their bonds." He had not expected to "get much money from them," since he had "supposed that Congress, in its discretion, in order to aid in reestablishing trade and prosperity, might think fit to relieve them from these claims." To a direct question whether any intimation was given to the companies that such would be the case, the General replied that he might have expressed the opinion in discussing the case because that had been his impression at the time, and he had always talked frankly with them.⁴¹

Eventually all arguments came back to the one ever-present issue, "right of capture." Priority of claims, claims for rental during the war, the legality of the bonds and sales—all depended in the final analysis on the legality of the rights which the Quartermaster Department asserted had been vested in the government by capture. All of the Tennessee roads contested the government's contention, but the Nashville and Chattanooga and the East Tennessee and Virginia put forward particularly specific arguments by their assertions that they had written contracts with Union generals.

Nashville and Chattanooga officials declared that they had never been southern sympathizers and that in March, 1862, after the occupation of Nashville by the Federal forces and the retreat of the Confederates, General Don C. Buell, who was in command of the Union army, appointed Colonel William S. Smith to take possession of the road. But Smith told Godfrey M. Fogg, general counsel and acting president of the company, that he would permit the company to run the road under the supervision of the military authorities. On second thought, however, he changed his mind and decided that the military authorities had better take the road, because if the company kept it there might be difficulties. Thereupon Colonel Smith requested that Fogg surrender the road, "informing him at the same time that he had been directed by General Buell to say that a strict account of the business of the road should be kept and the company should be allowed the regular charges for all transportation of the road, subject to the necessary expenses for

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 411.

running and keeping the road in repair." Fogg immediately complied, under the impression, he later declared, that the United States government would pay for the use of the road.

This version of events did not harmonize with Dana's information. In the first place, the company had been so disloyal to the Union that President Vernon K. Stevenson had been absent from the city when Buell marched in because he had preferred to go South with the retreating Confederates in order to continue his efforts in behalf of the Confederacy. In the second place, no evidence was furnished to show that an agreement had been made. Finally, even if such an agreement had been made, thought Meigs, it would not be binding on the government after possession of the road had been wrested from General Buell by the Confederates, even though it was subsequently recovered by the United States.⁴²

The East Tennessee and Virginia had a much stronger case, and one for which even a Secretary of War had vouched. Soon after the end of the war he had declared that "it is within the personal knowledge of the Secretary of War, ad interim, that the East Tennessee & Virginia Railroad passes through a thoroughly loyal part of Tennessee, is owned by loyal people, and was during the war, through the agencies of loyal directors, made most useful to the United States Government."⁴³ Specifically, the company declared that upon the occupation of East Tennessee by the Federal forces under General Ambrose E. Burnside in 1863, it had "turned over the Machine Shops, Rolling stock, etc., in its possession to the United States authorities, voluntarily, and in compliance with a resolution of its Board of Directors," and it had "obtained an endorsement from General Burnside substantiating in a measure this statement."

These assertions were flatly denied by the Quartermaster Department. To contradict the endorsement of the Acting Secretary of War, Dana referred to a letter written on March 22, 1862, by John R. Branner, president of the company, in which he said that he was a southern

⁴² Meigs to Allan Rutherford, August 6, 1870, VI, 338-49.

⁴³ Quoted, Dana to Meigs, January 25, 1869, III, 717-25.

man, identified with the South and ready to sacrifice all he had to maintain the Confederate government. He had devoted all his time and attention to the road since the outbreak of hostilities in order to aid the Confederate States in transporting troops and army supplies.⁴⁴

After hearing all the available testimony, a House investigating committee declared that "there is an entire absence of testimony to show opposition to, or even open disapprobation of the rebellion, or earnest sympathy with the United States Government." The most charitable interpretation that could be placed upon his action was that Branner had tried to save his property by appearing all things to all men: as a Confederate sympathizer to the South and as a Union man to the North. But, the committee concluded, "is the country prepared to say Union men are justified in aiding the rebellion to save their property? The committee think not. And this is the most favorable aspect of the case."⁴⁵

Like the Nashville and Chattanooga, the East Tennessee and Virginia was unable to produce the alleged contract, and Dana concluded that no contract had ever been made with General Burnside, either direct or implied.⁴⁶ Furthermore, he thought that the company was exaggerating its willingness to surrender its property to the Union army. Out of eighteen or nineteen engines, all except three had been taken inside the southern lines, and two of those remaining had been captured while on their way. Of about ninety cars, only five flat and two box had been left, and the latter were not on trucks. This stock had been "removed within the rebel lines, voluntarily, by the management of the road, several days after the evacuation of Knoxville by the rebels," according to Dana.⁴⁷

The resolution of the Board of Directors, upon which officials of the company placed so much emphasis, was of a somewhat equivocal nature, to say the least. Meeting at Rogersville Junction, outside Knoxville, on September 2, 1863, the directors had acknowledged that "we

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

⁴⁵ *House Report*, No. 15, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 22.

⁴⁶ Dana to Meigs, January 25, 1869, III, 717-25.

⁴⁷ *House Executive Document*, No. 73, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 17.

are today informed and believe our machine shops, tools, etc., in Knoxville, are in the hands of the federals"; therefore, they had resolved, "we deem it impossible under these circumstances to run our trains upon said road, and now suspend the running of them for the present: and, in the event it is possible and prudent to run said road or a portion of it, the President and superintendent are authorized to resume it and suspend it as the emergency under the circumstances requires." The investigating committee was not unjustified in remarking that "in a manner very similar to this General Lee succeeded in turning over to General Grant a very large amount of munitions of war and a large number of prisoners."⁴⁸

Even if the companies had been correct in their allegations, the government had other good arguments. In the so-called Prize Cases the Supreme Court had declared that persons residing in the "Rebel" states at any time during the Civil War must be considered as enemies during their residence, without regard to their personal sentiments or dispositions.⁴⁹ So, legally at least, the roads were captured by the armies of the United States from the enemy.

General Dana was emphatically of the opinion that the alleged agreement could not bind the United States either in law or equity. "It was an agreement for the use of a thing, possession of which" had been gained "by capture from a public enemy during military operations." That capture was accomplished by force of arms and in no way depended upon the wishes or consent of the contracting parties. And the property had been used by its owners in aid of the rebellion and in violation of the law of the United States. "It was a contract with a public enemy; against public policy and not sanctioned by law." A promise by a Union general to pay "every mounted rebel officer who was captured with his horse and accoutrements for the use of the horse and accoutrements would be equally binding upon the United States" as a promise to pay for the use of the railroads.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ *House Report*, No. 15, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 19-21.

⁴⁹ 2 Black 666-78 (1862).

⁵⁰ Meigs to Rutherford, August 6, 1870, VI, 338-49.

While these controversies raged and while congressional investigators listened to endless testimony, the Quartermaster Department continued its efforts to collect the debts. When John A. Rawlins became secretary of war, President Johnson's order suspending action against recalcitrant companies was revoked and Meigs was directed to renew his efforts to collect the money due the government.⁵¹ Dana acted at once; on August 3, 1869, after final pleas had failed to bring success, he appointed receivers for the East Tennessee and Virginia, the East Tennessee and Georgia, the Nashville and Chattanooga, and the Nashville and Northwestern.⁵²

As he had expected, the companies refused to surrender their roads until they had tested the legality of the entire proceedings, and the Quartermaster Department prepared to go into the courts. Dana did not underestimate the task which lay ahead; he realized that there was "no doubt but that we have a hard fight on hand, and that the whole railroad interest of the state will be against us." As a precaution, he wished the suits to be heard "as far as possible from any local influence." Furthermore, he thought it would be advisable to bring the suits in the Circuit Court of the United States, so that in case of an appeal there would be only one step to the Supreme Court.⁵³

Suits were begun at almost the same time against all four of the Tennessee companies which had refused to surrender their property to the receivers,⁵⁴ and proceedings were instituted against several other companies from time to time thereafter. The inevitable delays of court procedure, combined with the purposely dilatory tactics of the companies, sufficed to put off any decision until Congress had taken matters out of the jurisdiction of the courts.

The first effective notice of the railroad indebtedness controversy taken by Congress had been the appointment of a House Select Committee on Southern Railroads during the Thirty-ninth Congress. The

⁵¹ *Id.* to John A. Rawlins, August 2, 1869, IV, 445-46.

⁵² Dana to Van Dyne and to C. H. Folsom, August 3, 1869, IV, 452-53, 447-48.

⁵³ *Id.* to Van Dyne, August 19, 1869, IV, 551-53.

⁵⁴ *Id.* to Stanley Matthews, September 11, 1869, IV, 628-32.

committee failed to complete its labors before the end of the Congress, so in pursuance of a resolution of March 27, 1867, it was reappointed and directed to report during the next session. In the course of taking more than a thousand printed pages of testimony, this committee thoroughly investigated the entire situation, for the first and last time.

Its report lent little comfort to the railroads. Its final digest of evidence began with a declaration that the railroads had "generally . . . failed to meet their obligations promptly." Some had "unbecomingly broken faith with the government," had "falsified their promises," and "presumed to bring forward as offsets" the claims for use of their roads during the war. "With life restored, for the time being, by the government, which they, as mighty and efficient instruments of war, had been attempting to destroy," they again sought "its vitals by attempting to absorb its material lifeblood, its financial substance." They were "callous to all feelings of gratitude." They asserted "claims against the government for the use of the roads, which very use had become necessary in order to suppress the very rebellion against that government which they themselves" had been, so far as testimony showed, "the willing instruments" in sustaining. "The red handed criminal, or using the mildest language" the committee could think "at all proper," the "particeps criminis," claimed "compensation for losses incurred in consequence of his own crime."⁵⁵

From these general remarks the committee went on to examine the evidence which had been presented, which was "positive and uncontradicted testimony as to the use of this property in aid of the rebellion, voluntarily on the part of presidents, directors, and stockholders of the railroads."⁵⁶ The committee was emphatically opposed to showing any generosity towards the southern indebted railroads, and nothing further was done during the life of the Fortieth Congress.

The passage of time and the unceasing efforts of the companies were not to be denied, however. On April 2, 1870, during the second session

⁵⁵ *House Report*, No. 15, 40 Cong., 2 Sess., 9-11.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 12 *et passim*.

of the Forty-first Congress, Benjamin F. Butler reported a bill from the Judiciary Committee "to provide for the collection of debts due to the United States from certain southern railroad corporations," but as Quartermaster General Meigs pointed out to Secretary Belknap, it might better have been called a bill to prevent the collection of those debts. That the interests of the government might be properly protected, Meigs carefully dissected the bill for the benefit of the Secretary.

Although the companies were prohibited from entering claims for occupation or rental of their roads during the war, the bill still left the way open to them to insist that the United States account to them for receipts obtained by the government from passengers and private freights. The second section of the bill, for the purpose "of avoiding litigation, and speedily adjusting and collecting the claims," provided for the appointment of three competent commissioners who would decide all controversies and claims between the railroad companies and the government. However, it did not give the commissioners the power to summon witnesses, nor to provide for their expenses.

All these controversies and claims had been properly settled once, Meigs pointed out, and there would be no justice in permitting the appraisal made by the board appointed by General Thomas to be disturbed, for "none will say these men did not perform their work faithfully and well." Furthermore, with the exception of the rolling stock, the property was worn out and could not be examined; and the rolling stock was so changed that any attempt to say what it was worth when purchased would be a farce. Finally, there was no time limit set for the deliberations of this all-powerful commission, and the entire matter could be kept open for years.⁵⁷

Meigs would have preferred to let the courts settle the entire matter, but Congress was intent on interfering. Two months after he had introduced the first bill, Butler introduced another. The accompanying report represented almost an entire volte face from the attitude expressed in its predecessor two years before; the arguments of the rail-

⁵⁷ Meigs to Belknap, April 18, 1870, VI, 69-78.

roads were now "equitable claims, and legal bars to a recovery by the United States," which would "give rise to very vigorous and protracted and expensive litigation." Therefore, it was an object worthy of consideration how this might be avoided and "justice done as well to the roads as the government." The committee expressed doubts of the validity of the bonds accepted by the roads under apparent compulsion, and could "not fail to believe" that there might be "equities in favor of the roads, or of stockholders therein" which were "entitled to be considered."⁵⁸

The House recommitted the bill, despite the favorable report of the committee, and affairs dragged on until the next session of Congress. Then both bills from the preceding Congress were resurrected, and on February 2, 1871, the House passed a bill which authorized the Secretary of War, if he deemed it advisable, "by and with the advice of the counsel of record in the law-suits, to compromise, adjust and settle the same upon such terms as to amount and time of payment as may be just and equitable and best calculated to protect the interests of the government." In the opinion of the Senate committee to which the bill was referred, such legislation would obviate the necessity for a decision by the courts of the many inconvenient and doubtful questions concerning the rights which capture had vested in the United States; it would forestall any definition of the obligations of the government to the owners of property taken and used during the war; and it would preclude any test of the validity of the bonds and agreements executed under alleged military coercion.⁵⁹

On March 3, 1871, at long last the indebted companies accomplished their aim: the relief act was passed, and at once compromises were begun. Of the fifty roads which had bought material valued at \$5,627,732.89 in 1865, five companies struck bargains with the government under this and a number of similar acts which followed in rapid succession. The Nashville and Chattanooga agreed to pay \$1,000,000.00 of the \$1,787,740.33 due; the Nashville and Decatur was to pay \$70,-

⁵⁸ *House Report*, No. 78, 41 Cong., 2 Sess.

⁵⁹ *Senate Report*, No. 349, 41 Cong., 2 Sess.

000.00 instead of \$301,430.87; the East Tennessee and Georgia and the East Tennessee and Virginia, owing \$366,029.44 and \$231,445.69, respectively, had merged, and would pay a total of \$195,000.00. In addition, the New Orleans and Ohio and the Mississippi, Gainesville and Tuscaloosa had gone bankrupt while still owing the government \$25,788.87 and \$43,745.40, respectively.⁶⁰

Within the next few years final payments were made except in six cases. A judgment was eventually obtained against the Nashville and Northwestern for \$866,150.00, but only a few thousand dollars due the company for carrying the mails was collected. The company was bankrupt and the balance due the government, \$852,968.35, had to be written off as a complete loss.⁶¹ The Edgefield and Kentucky, the McMinnville and Manchester, the Mobile and Ohio, and the Memphis, Clarksville and Louisville proved more recalcitrant, and made no efforts to adjust their debts. In 1887 the Mobile and Ohio finally paid, after a joint resolution of Congress had authorized a further scaling down of the amount. The debts of the other four proved too much for the Quartermaster to collect, and the final report he made on the subject, in 1888, twenty-three years after the debts had been contracted to be paid within twenty-four months, still listed the other three companies as debtors.⁶²

Considering the failure of Congress to support the efforts of the War Department, General Dana and his successors had been remarkably successful in their efforts. Of fifty purchasers, forty-seven had paid either in full or a compromise sum. Altogether about one million dollars was still unsettled after the compromise legislation of 1871, and if the interest accruing on the uncollectable principals involved were subtracted, the amount would have been considerably less. At no time had the amounts involved been large, compared to the sums which post-Civil War Congresses were handing over to the Pacific railroads. But to the companies in the border states the entire transaction had

⁶⁰ *Report of the Quartermaster General, 1876*, pp. 125-26.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 100-103.

⁶² *Ibid.*, 194.

been of vital importance; without the help of the government railroad reconstruction in the South inevitably would have been retarded even more than it was. On the other hand, the controversy involved legal problems so complicated that Congress preferred to compromise rather than to fight the issues through the courts. It seemed wiser to be lenient and subordinate apparent legal rights to expediency than to attempt to collect the pound of flesh. Against the general background of hate and irreconcilability which characterized the Reconstruction Congresses, the termination of the indebted railroad problem offers a welcome contrast.

Two Decades of Historical Activity in Virginia

BY LESTER J. CAPPON

It is well known that modern historical scholarship in the United States began to emerge in the 1880's with the establishment of the American Historical Association, the growth of graduate study in our universities, and the new emphasis upon scientific research.¹ In view of this fact, it may cause somewhat of a shock to point out that in Virginia this movement, in terms of professional scholarship and organized research, did not show signs of promise until the 1920's. Only after the World War did Washington and Lee University and the College of William and Mary enter upon their new careers of intellectual growth. In the same period the University of Virginia for the first time gave attention to the social sciences to an extent comparable with that in most American universities. A similar trend was noticeable, too, in a few of Virginia's smaller colleges. Agencies from outside the state, like the National Park Service, widened their scope of historical work. But not until the 1930's did the Old Dominion gain a position in historical activity and achievement to match even in a small degree her unique place in American history. Having taken root, however, this movement appears to have been stimulated rather than deterred during the years of prolonged economic depression.

In order to understand this belated emergence of modern historical research and writing, it is necessary to examine forces at work both within and outside the state. There are certain economic factors gen-

¹ Revision of paper read at the annual meeting of the Southern Historical Association, New Orleans, November 5, 1938.

erally recognized, especially the destruction wrought by the Civil War and the discouraging period of from thirty to forty years afterward before the South regained the wealth and capacity to produce as of 1860. After 1900 economic progress was more rapid and, before the flush times of the 1920's were past, Virginia was benefiting from the new program of efficiency and economy in state administration which was to ease the burden of the lean years just ahead. As late as 1927 Virginia's roads were an abomination to the weary traveler between Maryland and North Carolina who could hardly be blamed for making odious comparisons. The conservative pay-as-you-go program was generally approved of in Virginia and was applied to education as well as to highways. It is no wonder, then, that state educational institutions, finding the legislature closefisted and indifferent to the promotion of research, sought gifts and endowment, as private colleges were doing. It was just at this time that the state had first chance to purchase the valuable Brock Collection of Virginia manuscripts and imprints at a low figure, but no library had adequate funds to draw on for that purpose and of course a special appropriation was out of the question. Virginia's loss in this instance was the Huntington Library's gain.

Admitting the limited financial support of intellectual pursuits in the Old Dominion, we must examine certain intangible but equally significant factors causing the prolonged period of relative sterility in historical work. The pride of the Virginian in his three centuries of history, much of it embracing the main stream of American development, has been outweighed by his perennial indifference to the preservation of its rich material and to the writing of his own history. Few large manuscript collections of Virginia's revolutionary leaders and early statesmen under the Federal Constitution are to be found in Virginia repositories. During the ante-bellum period some of these were acquired by the Library of Congress and it may be recalled that the nucleus of this library's new collection in 1815 was Jefferson's private library sold to relieve his economic distress. The exploitation of Virginia's source materials has been continued intermittently for over a century by historical organizations of other states and by individuals

like the much-maligned Lyman C. Draper, to whom, in my opinion, gratitude is due for preserving what otherwise might have been lost or destroyed. The Virginia Historical Society, organized in 1836, has always accepted gifts of manuscripts, newspapers, books, and museum pieces; it made certain important sources available in its *Collections*, published during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and in its magazine; but remaining a small, rather exclusive organization instead of seeking affiliation with the state, the Society has missed a marvelous opportunity to enrich its resources and to serve the commonwealth by stimulating historical study. This was not a period of widespread, organized collecting, it is true, but rather a time when the individual scholar studied and wrote from such materials as might be found in the private and semiprivate libraries of friends and gentlemen's societies. Men like Philip Alexander Bruce who journeyed to remote county courthouses for detailed research in the local archives in order to recreate the life of seventeenth century Virginia, or like Francis Parkman of Massachusetts who traveled far afield to catch the spirit of American Indian life and customs,—such men are inspiring exceptions in the era of "armchair" scholars.

The raw materials of history, no matter how rich and abundant, have only potential value without the critical scholar. At the turn of the century there were a few productive historians in Virginia, but they worked in relative isolation without benefit of frequent association with others of the guild. A new generation's new points of view, springing from the use of recently discovered documents and the reappraisal of old material, were generally smothered in the morass of antiquarianism that prevailed. Heroic annals of the dead past for the sake of the past were the preferred brand of history. The antiquarian, who thrives especially well in an isolated locale, will always be with us as long as mankind likes to tell tales and surely Virginia had no monopoly on the species. Nevertheless, a virile crop of historians was lacking to counteract the blight.

The heritage of the "lost cause" with its defense mechanism had dulled the Virginian's critical sense of values and encouraged the writ-

ing of tracts rather than history in the best sense of the word. During ante-bellum decades and through the crisis of 1860-1861 Virginia's relation to the rest of the South had been tempered by her proximity to the North, the East, and the Old Northwest and by economic ties with all sections. As a result, her viewpoint represented a mixture of nationalism and southern sectionalism; her secession, long postponed, was precipitated only after long delay and Lincoln's call for troops. Not long ago a descendant of one prominent Whig leader earnestly declared to the writer that Virginia should not have joined the Confederacy to fight South Carolina's battles. Be that as it may, after the Civil War Virginia's attitude was for many years exclusively sectional and introvert. Local patriotism and family pride seemed to be all that remained worth cherishing. Even the past had ended in April, 1865—a point of view reflected in Virginia historical writing long after 1900. The references in Earl G. Swem's *Virginia Historical Index* are conclusive evidence on this point.

Thus the course of great events in her own history helps to explain why the static regime of the antiquarian could prevail so long in Virginia and enervate the efforts of a few of her younger sons to promote modern historical scholarship. The historical journals were confined almost entirely to the recital of well-known episodes in military and political annals, to genealogies in which the begat and the begotten were little more than lists of names, and to miscellaneous documents in need of an editor. During the half century after 1870, when college and historical libraries in the North were expanding by leaps and bounds, in Virginia they lacked the funds necessary merely to regain their status of 1860 and they quite overlooked most of the historical treasure in their very midst. An example might be cited of one official of a research agency who neglected the manuscripts in his own family trunks until they were woefully scattered. The task of reassembling them in the University of Virginia Library has been both intriguing and a bit disheartening when one thinks of what might have been.

During these years of almost imperceptible growth, one institution was pointing the way after 1900 in historical scholarship, namely the

Virginia State Library. The librarian, Henry R. McIlwaine, trained at the Hopkins, undertook the ambitious program of editing the official records of colonial and revolutionary Virginia preserved in the State Archives. It is unnecessary to inform historians how carefully and untiringly he executed this monumental task. Meanwhile, in the field of bibliography his assistant, Dr. Swem, facilitated research in Virginia history by compiling lists of the library's resources of maps, newspapers, and books, culminating in his invaluable *Bibliography of Virginia*, including all official documents from 1776 to 1916. In the annual reports and the *Bulletin* of the library appeared other reference works and a few monographs; a calendar of manuscripts and transcripts in the State Archives, prepared by Waldo G. Leland and others, had already been issued in 1905. Although the legislature never gave the State Library sufficient support, its income was so wisely expended and its document exchange privileges so judiciously used that a fine collection of printed works was acquired, notably strong in Americana (especially Virginia) but by no means restricted to this field. Until recent years, therefore, when scholars spoke of historical materials in Virginia repositories, they referred primarily to the State Library and Archives. While the Virginia Historical Society was well known too, its resources were all too frequently inaccessible.

The complex problems arising from the World War and its aftermath gave a new impetus to research in the social sciences throughout the nation. In attempting to probe the sources, students discovered a dearth of economic and social material in most libraries and few guides even to the better known material. Out of this situation were born the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies to sponsor projects in the social sciences and humanities, generously financed by the large foundations. In many respects the South offered a virgin field for prospecting, for preserving these materials, and for aiding students in research. When colleges and universities displayed some initiative in developing these disciplines, they thereby improved their chance of obtaining substantial support from the national agencies. In this manner the Institute for Research in the Social Sciences

was established at the University of Virginia in 1926 and later the grant was renewed when the state agreed to match funds on an increasing scale. The Institute, under the able directorship of Wilson Gee, attracted young scholars to the University to study historical and contemporary problems of Virginia and the South. Some of these men have since served Virginia and other states in various governmental capacities. Genuine interest in the social sciences was greatly stimulated in the University; a series of published monographs was begun and is continuing; and the growing prestige of the Institute made possible the inception of the University library's program for collecting and preserving historical materials to promote further research.

This development in one educational institution may serve to emphasize three essential and closely related factors in the evolution of that scholarship which, as we have seen, had long been wanting in Virginia. If "no man liveth unto himself," neither can any state or section live in isolation. Virginia began to examine her immediate problems, to study her past from a viewpoint less provincial, and to recognize the value of interchange of ideas with men and women from other states and sections. No longer were her colleges and universities, which had sent out many graduates beyond her own boundaries, to be exclusively Virginian in personnel. With this broadening outlook came a real appreciation of the opportunity to utilize the abundant materials close at hand and through research to present a positive picture of her past and contemporary civilization, not taking the defensive but seeking to interpret every period from its own record, from a knowledge of what preceded and what followed, and by means of the relation of the particular period in mind to the present. The third point is the necessity of adequate financial support, serving both as cause and as effect. Bona fide research is expensive, but in Virginia, as elsewhere in America, it has won deserved recognition, in spite of widespread abuse of the term.

In surveying the work of Virginia historical agencies during the progress of recent years, it is significant that in almost every instance the greatest advance has been made by those organizations showing

little or no previous achievement. Of the three institutions offering the widest variety of historical materials, viz., the College of William and Mary, the University of Virginia, and the State Library, only the last named, as already indicated, had made any notable contribution earlier. The growth of the Richmond Public Library in its new building has enabled the State Library to concentrate more exclusively on research material. The State Archives department has continued its program of photostating county and church records antedating 1800, although few of the originals are retained. The official records of the commonwealth now in the archives have expanded far beyond the fireproof addition to the State Library building, and no satisfactory guide to the archives exists. Archival policy, so far as there is a conscious policy, and the relation between state and local archives need thorough study, revision, and new legislation. However, the prospects for the near future are brighter. A new building is now under construction. The staff has been reorganized to include a principal archivist and, with the elimination of congested quarters and the expectation of a larger personnel, it will be possible to concentrate upon more vital problems.

At the College of William and Mary the development of the library under the scholarly direction of Dr. Swem preceded and then paralleled increased instruction in the social sciences. The new library building was soon outgrown and enlarged to keep pace with acquisitions. From Dr. Swem's historical and bibliographical research evolved the plan of collecting Virginia imprints and manuscripts, as time permitted, as a special feature of the library. This has stimulated and justified a certain amount of research in the college. More important, however, is the service the library renders to its next-door neighbor, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, and to historical students in general who may have occasion to work in Virginia sources. A marked improvement is in evidence, too, in the caliber of the *William and Mary College Quarterly*.

Looking at historical activity in terms of library resources, one can explain in large measure the long delayed advent of graduate study and research in the social sciences in the University of Virginia. When the old order in the library gave place to the new in 1927, there existed a

rather remarkable book collection consisting of such volumes before 1895 as were salvaged from the disastrous fire of that year, of miscellaneous replacements from generous alumni and other friends of the University, and of regular acquisitions since that date. It was a curious situation of often finding the unexpected and of not finding the commonplace. The shelving of volumes on the circumference of the historic Rotunda, the lack of scientific detail in the old catalogue, and the polite hours of service suggested rather the gentleman's collection than the University library. There was a small accumulation of manuscripts and newspapers, but in some instances their origin was unknown. Under the direction of Harry Clemons, the program of the new order, calling for recataloguing and the systematic development of all essential departments of a modern university library, was predicated upon a steadily increasing budget, a new building in the near future, and a mounting demand for research facilities—none of which was assured. It was clearly an act of faith, sorely tested during the lean years of drought and depression, but amply justified and rewarded. The relation of the University's Research Institute to the collection of historical materials has been pointed out. Begun with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for the year 1930-1931, this project was later included in the budget of the library. By the time the plans were drawn for the new building, the accumulation of manuscripts, newspapers, pamphlets, maps, etc., was extensive enough to warrant special attention in assuring adequate space and equipment for this material and its prospective expansion. The opening of the Alderman Memorial Library in May, 1938, marked undoubtedly the beginning of a new era in the evolution of the University of Virginia and in the promotion of historical research in the state. The gift of the late Tracy W. McGregor's library of rare books on American history and English literature, presented to the University later that year, has further enhanced the opportunities for original research.

Few other colleges in Virginia have made a special effort to develop historical collections of note and encourage research, nor should they be expected to do so. Two institutions, however, have entered the field

to a limited extent, chiefly through the initiative of certain faculty members and librarians—Washington and Lee University and Randolph-Macon Woman's College. Both have small but growing manuscript collections and some rare printed works. Virginia Polytechnic Institute, with its emphasis upon contemporary agricultural problems and with enlarged resources from the Federal government, gives promise of acquiring materials which will attract the historian as well as the economist and sociologist.

Virginia with its predominant agricultural life has produced no huge public libraries such as sometimes become repositories of important historical collections. Nevertheless, a creditable number of such institutions in the larger cities and towns have provided resources for the scholar in the form of local newspaper files which, until very recent years, had been relatively unknown for want of an inventory. These files are a fine illustration of what constructive work can be done by local citizens interested in local history.

In the field of religious history three denominations have made a consistent effort to preserve their records and make them available for students. At the headquarters of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of Virginia in Richmond are its archives of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and a number of old parish records from various churches in the area. The diocesan secretary hopes to centralize all such manuscripts as the local churches cannot safeguard. Most of the extant colonial registers and vestry books are available in the Virginia State Archives, where they are on deposit from the Episcopal Theological Seminary at Alexandria. The achievement of the Virginia Baptist Historical Society is especially noteworthy. It has assembled, through the enthusiastic efforts of the secretary, Dr. Garnett Ryland, and of his father before him, some 375 minute books of associations and congregations, and the collection is growing steadily. These, together with a sizeable body of periodical files, pamphlets, and books on the Baptists in Virginia and elsewhere, constitute a unique library, safely housed in the University of Richmond and made accessible to scholars. The Presbyterian Union Theological Seminary in Richmond is the official depository for

the manuscript records of the synods of Virginia and North Carolina. These records embrace some three hundred synod, presbytery, and church minute books dating back to 1755, as well as manuscript letters and church histories. The development of this collection in recent years has been the work of the librarian, Henry M. Brimm. The Methodists are also among the larger denominations in Virginia. It is regrettable that they have done almost nothing to preserve their original records or encourage the writing of their history.

Virginia, it is safe to say, has been no more careless of her local archives than most states, but with so large a proportion of statesmen whose signatures and holographs are a part of the records, her losses and relative lack of archival consciousness have been magnified. The indifference of the average American to his public records is notorious. Even if the policy of centralizing many of the older county records in the State Archives had been adopted, as in North Carolina, it could not have been effected to any great extent in Virginia because of lack of space. A state-wide survey of local archives, accomplished in a reasonable length of time, was desirable but not practicable without a large outlay of funds. This need was suddenly met by the Historical Records Survey in 1936 in its well-planned program of taking inventory of all local and state archives and making the data available to the public in printed or near-print form. The Chesterfield County Inventory, first to be completed, was published by the University of Virginia in August, 1938. Three others were issued by the end of 1939. The Historical Records Survey is unquestionably the most constructive factor in Virginia today in arousing public interest and producing concrete results in the field of local archives. The Federal Archives Survey has inventoried records in post office, Federal court, and other buildings throughout the state, but has not yet published any guides to these materials.

The patriotic societies in Virginia have done their most commendable work in financing the repair and photostating of many of the oldest county records. Here, too, is abundant opportunity for the local historical society to function, but it is a pointed commentary on historical activity in the state's one hundred counties that few such societies have

ever existed. They have left little published evidence of their activity and accumulated no collections. Only two or three societies are functioning today and it is an open question how much they should be encouraged to accumulate materials unless their permanent preservation can be well assured.

In spite of wars and the ravages of time, Virginia is rich in physical remains of her history. Many of these relics and artifacts are on exhibit in the older style of museum pieces, such as may be found in the Confederate Museum or in the Lee Collection at Washington and Lee University. A somewhat more modern approach is evident in numerous exhibits of nautical life and history (not restricted to Virginia) in the Mariner's Museum near Newport News. The State Conservation and Development Commission has been a pioneer in erecting highway markers to point out historic sites and buildings and provide the salient facts about them. Numerous historic houses have been repaired and re-furnished (sometimes overfurnished) with original pieces and reproductions under the auspices of the Association for the Preservation of Virginia Antiquities and other memorial organizations. These projects, however fine their historical contribution, have been somewhat overshadowed by the more complicated technique and elaborate scale of the Williamsburg Restoration. It is, of course, quite unnecessary to dwell upon the value of this recreated colonial Williamsburg to scholars in many different fields as well as to the general public. As another aspect in the recent development of historical research in Virginia the Restoration does deserve special comment because of the well-trained staff administering the files of original materials through which the whole project continues to function as a dynamic organism for its own progress and for the benefit of visiting scholars.

Two other projects involving restoration and the location of historic sites are to be highly commended. The National Park Service at Yorktown,² whose work antedates the Williamsburg Restoration, has carefully identified and marked the battlegrounds and environs in this part of the Peninsula. It has expanded its historical and archeological re-

² Its work at Petersburg, Fredericksburg, and Wakefield also deserves mention.

search to Jamestown where it is gathering data which have modified some of the previous conceptions of seventeenth century Virginia civilization. Here again, co-operation among the National Park Service, Colonial Williamsburg, and the College of William and Mary illustrate the new tempo and point of view of historical scholarship in the Old Dominion. The other project is the restoration of the McCormick homestead in Rockbridge County as it existed about a century ago. Under the expert direction of Herbert A. Kellar of the McCormick Historical Association, the first unit has been completed, consisting of the grist mill fully equipped with a replica of the machinery of that period, the mill pond and race, and the old slave quarters. The mill has been in operation and flour produced. Mr. Kellar has modestly informed the writer that those persons who have eaten the bread made from that flour are still living. If the proof of this research may be said to be in the eating, it is indeed worthy of study and emulation.

While Virginia has made notable progress in historical activity in a variety of ways during the past decade, it is clear that we have only scratched the surface. Impressive and stimulating as some of the results have already been, we are still in a period of stocktaking, of revealing hitherto unknown resources, of laying the groundwork for future research. There are challenging opportunities for co-operation among the scholars of Virginia institutions no longer isolated from the main currents of historical activities. Much reassessment will be necessary, for Virginia is no longer merely a "quaint" region with a romantic and tragic history. She is in a position to examine her past and her present critically and sympathetically and she offers a field of scholarship much broader than the area within her geographical boundaries.

Some Economic Aspects of British West Florida, 1763-1768

By C. N. HOWARD

The first recorded views of economic conditions in West Florida are those which were sent to the home government by the military officers.¹ Many of these officers appear to have agreed with those opponents in England of the treaty of 1763, who referred to that "barren swamp" of Florida.

Both Lieutenant Colonel Augustine Prevost and Captain Willsom Forbes, commandants at Pensacola, sent in reports on the eastern part of the province.² Pensacola in 1763 was not the most cheerful spot in the empire for the prospective settler or the military officer upon post duty. The buildings were largely in a state of ruin and decay, and the forest closed in on the town. Prevost's views as to the possibilities of the land as a colony were not enthusiastic, but in his reports he cloaked his tepidness for the present in an optimism for the future. The bay, he wrote, was full of good fish, and although the soil near the town was sandy, it was capable of producing good gardens. The Spaniards had done little, he interpolated, because of their insuperable laziness. Farther inland the soil was rich. All the usual fruits might be grown and likewise such valued West Indian products as indigo, cochineal, cotton, and sugar. Pitch, tar, rosin, and pine wood were to be had in quantities for naval stores. On the whole, the land *might* prove a useful colony, but, he warned, only hard work and "a number of useful inhabitants" could change the face of the colony.

¹ Public Record Office, Colonial Office Papers (cited hereafter as P.R.O., C.O.), 5/632.

² *Ibid.*

Immediately upon his arrival, Major Robert Farmar, commandant at Mobile, began to take a careful stock of the new province. At Mobile the ramshackle town might be reconstructed; a wavering, almost disappearing road, and an Indian ferry across Mobile Bay led to Pensacola; the harbor was good, but the bar would have to be removed and a channel made. The soil along the coast was sandy but not unfertile, and Farmar, like Prevost, thought that it was entirely capable of producing good rice and cotton.³ Prevost wrote that the soil around Pensacola was able to produce good vegetables and that farther inland the country was capable of any improvement.⁴ Scattered through the country from Lake Pontchartrain to Mobile there were isolated plantations; most of them were in French hands or had been taken over recently by the English.⁵ Farmar observed that north of Mobile the soil was very rich and in some spots the land was heavily forested. There were swamps in unexpected places, and indeed they almost surrounded Pensacola and Mobile on two sides. Dr. John Lorimer, the surgeon general of the military forces in West Florida, wrote: "As to the situation of Mobile you very well know, that from the east to the north of it, is entirely swamps and marshes, for as far or even farther than the eye can reach. . . . The ground upon which the town stands is as low or even lower than any thereabout, and the fort is situated on the very lowest spot in the town."⁶ In the interior almost tropical jungles made the land actually untraversable in places.⁷ The most cultivated part of the province lay in the valley above Mobile where the Alabama and Tombigbee rivers twined around fertile islands, rushed through narrow, rocky gorges, and tumbled over waterfalls of amazing beauty.

³ Robert Farmar's Report, P.R.O., C.O. 5/582.

⁴ Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766, English Dominion* (Nashville, 1911), I (Vol. II has not been published), 136-37; P.R.O., C.O. 5/582.

⁵ Minutes of the Council, *passim*, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁶ Surgeon General John Lorimer's Report, quoted by Peter J. Hamilton in *Colonial Mobile* (Boston, 1910), 266-67. The Minutes of the Council report several times the granting of swamps at various "ends of the town" of Pensacola. P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁷ Bernard Romans, "An Attempt Towards a Short Description of West Florida," in Philip L. Phillips, *Notes on the Life and Works of Bernard Romans* (Deland, Fla., 1924), App., 121; P.R.O., C.O. 5/582, 632.

There the French Intendant and wealthier settlers had established their plantation houses.⁸

In the light of thorough surveys and commercial scouting undertaken later by the British government, this was indeed a rich country, capable of producing rare crops especially valuable to a mother country under the mercantilist system. Probably the best example of reporting on the colony's resources was made by Bernard Romans, one of the Crown surveyors.⁹ His report was submitted in 1772, but the descriptions of the country are appropriate for almost the entire British period. In speaking of the country above Mobile and at the head of Pensacola Bay, he said:

Concerning the Navigation of this River [Pasca Oocoloo] I shall only Say . . . Anno One thousand Seven hundred and Seventy, there was a Vessel Built at Chicasatray, two hundred Miles from the Sea if Measured in a Streight line, which Vessel brought down to the Sea Six hundred Bushells of Corn besides a Considerable Quantity of Deer Skins. The Next River is the Tombechbe Certainly the first in North America after the Mississippi and St. Lawrens, Whether it be Considered for its Extensive Navigation which Begins in Latitude 35°: 20 and after Receiving . . . the Great River of the Alibamas, on its Eastern side . . . Glides Gently thro' Innumerable Islands . . . and at Mobile the Islands Ending it becomes Above Eight Miles Wide, and then Assuming the Name of Mobile Bay, Disembogues itself into the Gulph of Mexico in Lat^e: 30°: 11 I myself Came down its Stream Above Six hundred Miles. This River also Abounds in very Fertile Soil, I Cut a Cane on its Banks which Measured Forty Seven Feet from the third Joint, to its Extremity, thirteen of its Joints I brought down to Mobile and Presented to the Honorable John Stuart Esquire in January of this Instant Year . . . which each of them were in Length Above Twenty Inches, and Above five Inches Circumference, nor was this an Extraordinary Case. . . . This River in Process of time must Indubitably become a fine Settlement not Inferior by itself to any Province now known. By Means of this River Mobile will One Day become the only Mart, for the Skin Trade from the Chactaw, Chickesaw, and Upper Creek Nations. From here Eastward the Land diminishes in Goodness. The next River is the Perdido of Inconsiderable Note either for Navigation, or Plantable Lands, it rises in Latitude 31.°:10', and this makes but a Short Course. But it together with the Styx, Roche Blave, and all its other heads, are invaluable on Account of the Incomparable pasture it Affords, it even now Maintains between it and the Taenso Branch of the Mobile above

⁸ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 287 and n.

⁹ See n. 7.

Ten Thousand Cattle and Horses, the Three Rivers Viz. The Scambe Middle River and Chester are of the Utmost Consequence to the Town of Pensacola and will Undoubtedly prove One of the Sources of its future Wealth. On Chester River and the Scambe there are Abundance of Valuable Rice Lands, such as have enriched the Planters in Carolina, and Georgia. On the Scambe the Swamps being higher and easier drained, they are upon that Account at Present more Valuable to a Colony where Working hands are as yet Scarce, and where Labour is for that Reason Expensive, but when the Country comes to be better Peopled the Rice Lands on Chester River may be made Equal to any in America. The Middle River has few or no rich Swamps upon it, only in some places there are Boggs . . . and even the Want of Swamps upon this River is an Advantage, for by the Number of Landing places, which it Affords, the Town of Pensacola can always be Supplied with Various kinds of Excellent Timber, with which the Country Adjacent to the Middle River Abounds, tho' it Already begins to be Scarce below the Swamps on the Scambé and Chester Rivers, will prevent the making of Roads there except at a very Great Expence. On the East and the North East of Scambé these swamps and Boggs, I found so Extensive as to render it impossible for me to Examine these parts more particularly this Wet Season. On the West side of the Scambe . . . there are likewise a great Many Boggs, so that I found it Difficult to pass there with Light Loads, even in the Dryest Season of the Year.¹⁰

Pensacola was occupied by the British troops in August of 1763 and Mobile was occupied in October of the same year. The period of time between the military occupation and the arrival of the civil governor, George Johnstone, constituted an interval of provisional and military government.

Although there was a bustle and a busyness in the province during these days of the military government, neither Mobile nor Pensacola had a prosperous appearance. Both civil and military buildings were little more than shacks, sometimes with brick foundations, and usually with bare board walls and roofs thatched with palmetto leaves. An excellent firsthand description of Pensacola and Mobile in the autumn of 1764, just after the Governor's arrival, was given by Lord Adam Gordon in his journal.¹¹ Sanitary conditions were primitive; and a roof that

¹⁰ Romans, "An Attempt Towards a Short Description of West Florida," in *loc. cit.*, 120-21.

¹¹ [Lord Adam Gordon], "Journal of an Officer Who Travelled in America and the West Indies in 1764 and 1765," in Newton D. Mereness (ed.), *Travels in the American Colonies* (New York, 1916), 365-453.

did not leak after a heavy downpour was almost a nine days' wonder.¹² Mobile was a hotbed of malarial fevers. The climate required some adaptation on the part of the settlers, and it was evident that some experimentation with the normal European diet would be necessary. The use of meat as a dietary staple would have to be cut down, and the consumption of spiritous liquors reduced to a minimum if the circumstances of the new climate were to be combatted. Brigadier General Frederick Haldimand, who later was in command of the Southern District under General Thomas Gage, got at the root of the matter when he wrote that temperate men had nothing to fear in the climate. Added to imprudence was lack of medicine or proper hospital accommodation. Yet, although the British at Mobile and Pensacola fell ill by the score, it was evident that Europeans could live in the climate, for the French population thrived and apparently suffered very little illness.¹³ Side by side with the newcomers, or perhaps underneath the new British life in the colony, the French settlers who remained continued their ways of life as before the occupation. The old French curé at Mobile celebrated mass and ministered to his charges undeterred by the new government.¹⁴

Many of the inhabitants in the former French territory hastened to take the oath of the new allegiance and to secure the quiet possession of their lands;¹⁵ in several instances these persons purchased the lands of their departing countrymen.¹⁶ Some of the French competed with the British agents for army contracts,¹⁷ notably at Mobile, where the employment of Rochon and Company by Farmar, and later by Haldimand, in the repair of Fort Charlotte—the former Fort Condé—led to

¹² Farmar's Report, P.R.O., C.O. 5/582.

¹³ Hamilton, in the chapter entitled "Sickness" in his *Colonial Mobile*, 264-74, has an excellent discussion of this subject. He has drawn his material from the reports of Dr. John Lorimer, surgeon general of the colony; also from Bernard Romans and the Haldimand Papers. See also, [Gordon], "Journal of an Officer," in *loc. cit.*, 381-88; Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, *passim*.

¹⁴ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 273-74; P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

¹⁵ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 119-22.

¹⁶ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*

ill feeling and accusations of self-interest.¹⁸ The preparations of the Twenty-second Regiment for the expedition up the Mississippi¹⁹ added to the bustle of temporary prosperity in the province, yet actual specie was scarce, and Farmar's bills on the Lords of the Treasury, drawn through New York, were accepted with reluctance.²⁰

Mobile, during the military rule, was the actual capital of the province. The French settlers had not evacuated the province to a man as the Spanish had done, nor had English speculators arrived before the troops. There was more to be done here than at Pensacola. Forts Charlotte and York—the former Fort Tombeckbé—were the two posts occupied in the territory, and at both Farmar and his officers supervised the adjudication and registration of land transfers, the registration of the new French subjects, the organization of the garrisons, the collection of agricultural and commercial information for the Board of Trade, and the repair of the fortifications.²¹ The British were busy with plans for land cultivation and exploitation of trade.²² At Pensacola the Thirty-fifth Regiment had been stationed²³ and many of its members joined the growing population of the colony. They petitioned for lands to be granted them in accordance with the King's proclamation of grants to all men who had served in the late war. The establishment of former soldiers as settlers on the frontier was appreciated by the government as a means of providing an experienced militia to aid the regular troops in the defense of the colony.

¹⁸ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 253, 272-74; Douglas Brymner (ed.), "Calendar of Papers in the Haldimand Collection," in *Report on Canadian Archives* (title varies), 1884, 1885, 1886, 1889 (Ottawa, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1890). These papers have been transcribed from the originals in the British Museum.

¹⁹ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 138.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 9.

²¹ "Military Papers of Major Robert Farmar," P.R.O., War Office 1/49.

²² *Ibid.* This is, perhaps, a justifiable reading of the later Minutes of the Council and the various letters to home officials. Major Willsom Forbes, in command at Pensacola with the Thirty-fifth Regiment after November 30, 1763, seems doubtful. P.R.O., C.O. 5/632; Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 142.

²³ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 141; Clarence E. Carter (ed.), *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage with the Secretaries of State, 1763-1775*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1931), I, 14.

Men such as John MacGillivray, Daniel Clarke, and James McIntosh, whose family names were later famous in the southern country, competed with swarms of illicit and unscrupulous traders who invaded the Indian lands with rum and firearms to exchange for a quick wealth in furs. To control this trade, which always caused trouble with the Indians, Farmar and Prevost quickly issued trading licenses, and the Indians were warned to demand these as evidence of good faith. This policy applied more specifically to the French subjects under Farmar's administration. All licenses had to be renewed under the civil government and the council tried to maintain a special control over the traders.²⁴

The Indians were still uncertain in their attitude. After the arrival of the British some of the smaller tribes followed the French to New Orleans while others moved elsewhere.²⁵ The federation of the Creek, Choctaw, Cherokee, and Chickasaw, which exercised as great an influence in the South as the Iroquois in the North, had acquiesced in at least a formal acceptance of the British, although they scarcely went beyond this in any expression of friendship.²⁶ During the winter of 1763-1764 Pontiac carried his campaign into the southern country.²⁷ His oratory won some of the small tribes on the Mississippi to his cause, and placed difficulties in the way of the British ascent of the river.²⁸

In this period plantations, small farms, and gardens, which had been taken over from the French and Spanish, were cultivated, and crops of fruit, vegetables, lucerne, and maize were planted and harvested. Be-

²⁴ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 18, 93; P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

²⁵ James Adair, *History of the American Indians* (London, 1775), 267; William Bartram, *The Travels of William Bartram* (London, 1792), 461-62; Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 239-50.

²⁶ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 11; Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile* (Boston, 1898), 183-84. All other citations to Hamilton's work are to the 1910 edition.

²⁷ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 17; Clarence W. Alvord and Clarence E. Carter (eds.), *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, The British Series* (Springfield, 1916-), I (1916), 242.

²⁸ Alvord and Carter (eds.), *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, The British Series*, I, 234-36.

ginnings were made in the growing of rice and indigo. The markets of the towns were filled at seasons with Indians, traders, and merchants, exchanging goods. Although the population was largely military and trading in character, an English life had begun in the colony.²⁹

A large contraband trade with New Orleans and the former French territories across the Mississippi had rapidly sprung up. François-Xavier Martin gives an excellent picture of one phase of the trade: "In the meanwhile, British vessels began to visit the lower banks of the Mississippi—after passing New Orleans . . . made fast to a tree . . . where the people of the city and neighbouring plantations came to trade with them. . . . The wants of the colony induced its chief to . . . tolerate the illegal traffic."³⁰ A considerable amount of the correspondence with the Board of Trade dealt with this borderland traffic. There were lively expectations of a considerable Spanish trade, and retired soldiers and civilians established themselves temporarily on sites which would be advantageous for dockyards and careening plants. Both Mobile and Pensacola harbors were surveyed in a preliminary fashion, and pilots established themselves for the time being at the entrance to both by permission of the military authorities, pending grants of a more permanent nature by the governor and council when civil government should be established.

In reality the new colony of West Florida had begun to take form on the lands upon the Gulf thrown open to settlement some time before the publication of the proclamation of October 7. Land speculators and agents of London merchants had arrived even before Prevost had occupied Pensacola, and with their arrival West Florida entered the commercial market as one of the new and unknown commodities in the empire.

Opinions in the home and colonial money markets concerning the value of West Florida were varied. Information was vague, and most of the prominent merchants and possible investors were uncertain

²⁹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

³⁰ François-Xavier Martin, *The History of Louisiana, from the Earliest Period*, 2 vols. (New Orleans, 1827-1829), I, 345-46.

which qualities and products belonged to West Florida, which to East Florida, or which might be common to both. Some echoed the sentiment of former French and Spanish officials that West Florida was nothing better than a barren sandbank. Others declared that it was as wealthy in indigo, cochineal, sugar, cotton, and pine, as any West Indian isle and needed but to be cultivated. Later reports inclined more to the latter view.

The year 1764 saw the beginning of the rush for the lands immediately surrounding Pensacola and Mobile Bay; news of West Florida was carried by ship, or traveled overland from post to post into Georgia, Carolina, and Virginia, and to their money marts, Savannah, Charleston, and Richmond. Wandering parties in the lonely valleys of the Appalachians turned their steps, even at this early period, toward the new lands open for settlement. The English merchants began their exploitation of the province before the arrival of the troops of occupation. When the military officials arrived, manifestoes were issued requiring the registration of all transfer of lands and approval by the commandant.

The growing enthusiasm for the wealth of the Floridas and Grenada affected the Court as well as other groups in the home society, and men may have remembered the colonizing days of Charles II. There had been the foundation of the Carolinas, and, but recently, of Georgia. How much more valuable must be the Floridas, with their southerly location more favorable to the growth of the valued semitropical products? Likewise they were on the Gulf and had been a part of the hated Spanish monopoly. At last England had broken into the choicest and most favored part of the continent for exploitation and settlement. There were men about the Court who were willing to lend their patronage, and magnates in the city who were willing to invest their money in companies that might be formed.

It became known that the King must look with favor upon the new plantations, for, it was rumored, a company had been formed of which their Royal Highnesses, the Dukes of York and Cumberland, were the patrons. The prime minister and other considerable magnates were said

to have joined their names in the company. Rumor was correct, if James Noble's testimony before the governor and council is to be relied upon. He asserted that the Earl of Bute, Lord Mansfield, Augustus Keppel, in command at Jamaica, Marriott Arbuthnot, John Lindsay, also in command in the Caribbean, had joined with John Kinnion, Esquire, and Samuel Touchet, Esquire, London merchants, in the new colony company. Governor Johnstone threw some doubt upon Noble's statements, but without presenting his evidence.⁸¹ There was this difference between these investors and the founders of the Carolinas. There was no question of a charter from the Crown for colonization in the old proprietary sense. The territory of West Florida was to be governed as a royal colony, and the new company was formed purely for investment and speculation in lands.

Three speculators, Noble, Horsefall, and Page, purchased sixteen Spanish estates for different members of the company. The whole of a vast unsurveyed tract of land near Pensacola claimed by the Yamasee Indians was purchased by these ardent real estate promoters. The sale was ratified by Don Diego Ortiz Parilla, the Spanish governor. The Indians had decided to follow the Spaniards in the evacuation and withdraw to New Spain. At both Pensacola and Mobile officers, privates, and contractors in the army train purchased lands from the departing inhabitants.⁸² In the vicinity of the forts steps were taken to prevent the sale of Crown property by retiring foreign officials.⁸³

The arrival of Governor Johnstone and the setting up of the civil government made a considerable degree of difference. The case of Noble, who was later termed by Governor Johnstone the principal speculator in Spanish lands around Pensacola,⁸⁴ is a case in point. The governor and council decided in this case to disallow the claim of Noble's company to the Yamasee land on the ground that the "plan exhibited did not carry the slightest representation of the actual face of

⁸¹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 15-17, 60-63.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 456. A copy of Johnstone's letter is in P.R.O., C.O. 5/583.

the country which was pretended to be Described; That the Several Claims of Mr. James Noble were not sufficiently supported either by external or Internal Evidence, that Governor Parilla in no way had any authority to ratify the sale, and leaving, nevertheless Party or Parties at Liberty to sustain their Claims in England."³⁵ Governor Johnstone wrote, "Every means by proffers and threats have been used to induce me to be of opinion that M^r James Noble actually purchased an Estate of . . . Nine naked Indians. for Edward Duke of York, William Duke of Cumberland &c. and that for the said premises, to the said Naked Indians, he had payed 120,000 Mexican Dollars, of the money of M^r Kinnion, Touchet and others; but even this is not the most absurd Article in his Transactions."³⁶

The decision of the governor and council in this case and in other suits of Noble was based largely upon a different interpretation of the twentieth article of the Treaty of Paris from the interpretation of that article put forward by Noble. The governor and council maintained that the land of the colony belonged to the Crown of Great Britain, to which it had been ceded by the Crown of Spain and the Crown of France. In theory the Crown of England in this western land was willing to recognize the deed of sale of any property which could present a valid French or Spanish title, provided the sale did not interfere with the intended laying out of the colony by the Crown.³⁷

Practically all of the pretended Spanish sales to land speculators around Pensacola were disallowed on the ground that the Spanish titles were invalid. The same held true of the French sales around Mobile, with the exception that more French titles than Spanish were held valid. Practically all of the speculators and other previous purchasers of lands declined to attempt to sustain their claims to the lands purchased from Frenchmen or Spaniards, but availed themselves of the equitable adjustment of grace granted them by the council if they threw themselves

³⁵ Minutes of the Council, January 24, 1765, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

³⁶ "The Governor's Complaint of the Chief Justice," in Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 466.

³⁷ See resolutions of the council in the Minutes of the Council, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

upon its justice. In all such cases the petitioners were promised that they would be granted their lands, or a considerable proportion of them under a British grant, provided the grants did not interfere with the plans for the laying out of the colony, a program which the government was following with a certain degree of system. This planned system is clearly evident in the laying out of Pensacola.

The emphasis upon Crown ownership is unmistakable. Noble and one or two others were the only persons who attempted to defend their claims, and in most of these cases the petitioners were denied, but admitted to the grace of the Crown. In the case of the French around Mobile there was an exception. During the period of the military government the French landowners sent a petition to General Gage declaring that under the former rule they had held no other title to their lands but that of settlement and cultivation, which had been considered as a valid title and enough to guarantee the right of sale. Gage forwarded this petition letter to Halifax, who instructed Governor Johnstone to inquire into this matter as soon as he could conveniently do so. If such proved to be the case, he authorized the Governor to grant title to as much land as they were actually settling and cultivating and instructed him to report these grants to the home government.³⁸ He also authorized an extension of the time allowed for departure from the province of French subjects who would not take the oath of allegiance, on the ground that the troops did not take possession of the province until August of 1763, nearly six months after the exchange of final ratifications of the treaty.³⁹

It is clear then, that the Crown allowed in West Florida no previous and unprescribed movement of the colonists and speculators to circumvent its prerogative in the matter of the new territory. The borders of the existing colonies marked the boundaries of their jurisdictions, sea to sea and other charter rights to the contrary notwithstanding. The ceded territory in North America was the property of the Crown to be

³⁸ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 147-48.

³⁹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/582.

disposed of or to be retained in the manner which the Crown thought proper.

A study of the lands granted to settlers in the first half decade reveals several movements of settlement in the province. In the early months of 1765 the governor and council were largely concerned with the clearing of titles to land purchased by speculators before their arrival. When this matter had been settled they turned to the business of laying out the colony's lands upon the plan laid down by the Crown. A great number of grants were made to both speculators and new petitioners. By far the larger number of these grants were in the vicinity of Pensacola Bay and, indeed, in the vicinity of Pensacola itself. Only as the land on the peninsula upon which Pensacola was built was taken up, did the population spread slowly, first to the peninsula east of Pensacola and the island of Santa Rosa, then to the southeastern shore of the bay, and finally to the northwest and then northeast across the head of the bay close to the mouths of the Escambia, Middle, and Chester rivers. To the west of Pensacola a few settled themselves on the short-coursed rivers close to the sea. On one of these, for instance, Attorney General Edmund Rush Wegg, possessed himself of a fall, presumably for the purpose of using its power in a sawmill.⁴⁰

The country around Mobile Bay was settled more slowly and the grants were larger there. Neither shore of the bay appeared to be particularly favored, although the eastern side where Croftown was later established about half way down the shore, was by far the healthiest site. The removal of some of the troops to the eastern shore was largely due to Lorimer's report.⁴¹ Here there were fairly high cliffs which rejected the waters instead of swamps which invited them, as at Mobile. Here the air was clear and the breezes good. Mobile itself was unquestionably upon an unhealthy site. Lorimer, surgeon general of the province, wrote in one of his reports:

At Mobile the acid in the air is not more abundant than at Pensacola; iron and steel is therefore alike liable to rust at either of these places, but the mois-

⁴⁰ This material is largely drawn from the Minutes of the Council, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁴¹ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 270.

ture and damp at Mobile are very considerable, as I have found by several experiments. Nay this is evident from viewing the sun in the evenings, which about five o'clock begins to be a deeper hue and before he sets is nearly of the color of claret. If one leaves off his shoes for one day they are quite mouldy, and in the garrison or square the hardest and best polished wood will gather mouldiness in a short time. From the wells at Mobile they can only draw what we call hard water, except it is after a considerable rain; and the river contains innumerable impurities.⁴²

It remained true, nevertheless, that these swamps in the province and even those close to Mobile and Pensacola were in great demand for the growing of rice and other products which required a rich, damp soil. They were rapidly granted out by the governor and council to settlers upon condition that they would be promptly put under cultivation and that no tan pits or brick kilns would be erected.⁴³ The making of bricks was something of an industry in the province. They were not hard enough, however, and disintegrated beneath adverse weather conditions.⁴⁴

The lack of good means of communication, the formidable face of the country, and above all the necessity of group protection against the Indian danger inhibited wide and scattered settlement⁴⁵ in these years and caused the population to center about Pensacola and Mobile bays. Very soon after the establishment of civil government the provincial council resolved that it would be of great advantage to open a road between Pensacola and Mobile. A committee of the council laid plans for a road and post service, and drew up a table of fees. The project was embodied in an act of the Assembly on June 5, 1767. The road

⁴² From Lorimer's Report, quoted in *ibid.*, 266.

⁴³ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁴⁴ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 19, 31. A copy is in P.R.O., C.O. 5/582. It seems fair to assume, in absence of direct evidence to the contrary, that the brick used in Mobile, at least, was of local origin.

Hamilton quotes Romans as stating that a large deposit of good potter's earth was found by the British at a village on Mobile Bay—possibly Croftown. The Indians seem to have used this deposit of potter's earth for making earthenware vessels, and there is some indirect evidence that it may have been used for the same purpose by the British. Whether the British ever used this earth for making brick seems to be unrecorded. Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 270. See also, *ibid.*, 272, 576.

⁴⁵ See the Representation of the Council and Assembly to the Lords of Trade, November 22, 1766, P.R.O., C.O. 5/575.

was surveyed by Elias Durnford and apparently was completed and in use by 1770. The provincial government maintained the road, bridges, and the Perdido River canoe ferry, and the merchants of Mobile organized and maintained a post service to Pensacola to connect with the British packet service.⁴⁶ Well into the sixties there was a very real danger of Indian attacks on the British settlements in West Florida. Even in this early period, however, a few venturesome settlers invaded the upper waters of the Tombigbee River⁴⁷ where the French Intendant and others had had their plantations.⁴⁸ To the west of Mobile a few planters ventured close to the sea in the direction of the Pearl River and the lakes.⁴⁹

The course of settlement delineated above occupied approximately the first two years, to 1766. The two settlements of Mobile and Pensacola developed more or less simultaneously, but since the latter was the capital and its harbor bar perhaps a little less dangerous than that of Mobile, it grew much more rapidly.⁵⁰

The settlers in the southwestern corner of the province were largely French,⁵¹ Acadians, and Germans⁵² who had remained there after the British occupation, or who immigrated from Louisiana. The French

⁴⁶ Minutes of the Council, December 12, 1764, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632; Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 270-71. The Minutes of the Council show that the fourth Assembly of the province in March of 1770 accepted the proposal of a Captain McKensie to employ two companies, which were on the way to Mobile, to open a new road. Possibly the designation "new" refers to an improvement of the old road. There is some evidence which points to the use of this road by the British soon after their occupation of the province, but in all likelihood the road was little more than a trace. The Minutes of the Assembly show that on May 3, 1770, the Assembly returned public thanks to McKensie and the troops for aiding "more speedy communication" between the two towns. Minutes of the Assembly, May 3, 1770, P.R.O., C.O. 5/627.

⁴⁷ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁴⁸ Bartram, *Travels*, 401-403, 408; Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 287.

⁴⁹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁵⁰ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 1, 10, 13, 136, 142; Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 211; P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁵¹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/574, 575, 577, 632; Brymner (ed.), "Calendar of Papers in the Haldimand Collection," in *loc. cit.* See also, the indexes in Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, and in Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*.

⁵² P.R.O., C.O. 5/632; J. H. Deiler, "Settlement of the German Coast of Louisiana, and the Creoles of German Descent," in *German American Annals* (New York, Philadelphia, 1897-1919), XI (1909), 34-63, 67-102, 123-63, 179-207.

Crown had attracted to Louisiana a large number of Acadians from the thirteen colonies by the expedient of paying their expenses and subsidizing them for a short period. After 1768, when the Spanish took over Louisiana, the British, under Lieutenant Governor Montfort Browne, tried to draw them over into West Florida.⁵³ The settlement of French Huguenots at Campbelltown at the head of Pensacola Bay was not such a great success. The settlement had been fostered by the Board of Trade, but it failed to strike any deep root in these early years and remained largely a source of expense to the governor and council.⁵⁴

Late in 1767 two new movements in settlement began: one into the upper valleys of the Tombigbee and Alabama rivers and the other toward Natchez. The latter movement reached the proportions of a boom in the course of the next five years. Down the Ohio, the Tennessee, and the Mississippi settlers came from all of the seaboard colonies. Other older settlers in the colony who had taken lands along the seacoast where the soil was sandy gave up their claims, declaring that their lands were "barren," and petitioned the governor and council for a grant of the rich lands at Natchez. In most cases these petitions were granted, with one peculiarity, however, that in almost every case the governor and council granted exactly one half of the number of acres which the petitioner asked.⁵⁵

In the matter of towns the achievement of the British in the first five years was creditable. Both Mobile and Pensacola were laid out in town plans. At Pensacola a garden lot on the edge of the town was granted with each town or house lot. There was considerable speculation in property. Social classes, based largely on financial standing, rapidly formed, and in spite of the efforts of the governor to prevent it several men came to possess much more property than the average settler. The allotting of the town properties was done by a kind of lottery system, after the petitioners had been divided into classes which

⁵³ See Lieutenant Governor Browne to the Earl of Hillsborough, July 6, 1768, in P.R.O., C.O. 5/577.

⁵⁴ Minutes of the Council, *passim*, P.R.O., C.O. 5/632.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

had the first, second, and third choice of lots, according to their financial standing, and hence their ability to improve their property. The rule of forfeit for nonimprovement was apparently fairly strictly enforced.

Much progress in the settlement of the country was made during the first five years, although the great influx of the population came in the later years. Trade developed considerably in the first five or six years. In 1766 the commerce of the colony demanded at least "the annual visit of a vessel of 200 tons, filled with British manufactures and carrying back skins to London."⁵⁶ In 1772 Romans indicates the typical products of the colony. "Next as to its Natural Produce," he said, "it Abounds in Useful Plants Among which I think the Indigo deserves the first Rank, this we find in a very great Abundance and such as is known to be an Excellent Sort. Next the great Variety of Wild Pulse for feeding Cattle of all kinds, in Timber no Country on Earth can Surpass it, either in Quantity, Quality, or Variety."⁵⁷

During most of this period and, indeed, well on into the seventies, trade by canoe and packhorse was important, and the Indians formed a predominant trading element in the life of the colony. Hamilton says that the exports at this time were largely derived from them. He wrote: "The exports at this time . . . if not large in volume were certainly varied in nature. Indigo and hides probably led the list, but we find also timber and lumber, staves, peltry, cattle, corn, tallow, bear's oil, tar and pitch, rice, tobacco, myrtle wax, salted wild beef, salted fish, pecans, sassafras and oranges." He quoted Romans as saying that "vegetables, although not common at Pensacola, were raised in great abundance at Mobile, and that the only reason meat and fish were rare at both places was the indolence of the inhabitants, who let one or two butchers and three or four industrious Spanish hunters and fishermen fix their own prices." Cotton was also beginning to be grown in the province.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 259 n.

⁵⁷ Romans, "An Attempt Towards a Short Description of West Florida," in *loc. cit.*, 122-23.

⁵⁸ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 289-90.

In the matter of fish Romans conveyed the distinct impression that the fishing industry in the West Florida and Gulf waters, in comparison with the Newfoundland fisheries, made up in quality what it lacked in size. He said:

I have these Last Articles from my own experience of Three Years during this time I have Yearly Seen About One Thousand Tons Weight of dry'd Salted Fish go from the Western Shore of the Province of East Florida, to the Havannah, Besides what goes from the Eastern Shore. In this Trade they Employ About Thirty Vessels from fifteen to forty Tons, and none are navigated with less than Twelve Men the largest Sometimes Twenty or Twenty Eight, and most Come and go twice every Season, this we of both Floridas See and Sit Still, and with this Fish the West India Markets, but more Particularly Jamaica, may be Supplied at a Season when all their Northward Fish is bad, and begins to decay, so that the two Fisheries would by no means Interfere, with each Other; and I will be bold to say that the Coast will Admit of Six times that Number of Vessels to Load Annually. Add to this that the Sorts of Fish Caught here Always fetch a Much Greater price in the West Indies than the Cod from Newfoundland.⁵⁹

Romans is subject in many cases to the suspicion of exaggerating the prospects of the Floridas, but in this case he seems to present the evidence to support his claims for the fisheries. The irony of the matter lies in that, by his own testimony, it was the Spaniards, whom Prevost called "insuperably lazy," who played the largest part in keeping both the fish and meat trade from the hands of the British.

Two factors extraneous to West Florida caused a more pessimistic outlook upon the colony by the imperial government than was justified by the actual growth of its economic life. The first of these was the Spanish trade, from which the government at Whitehall had expected larger returns than were at first in evidence. Governor Johnstone wrote, "If the Spaniards come to New Orleans, which I have no Reason to doubt after the public Intelligence by His Majesty's Secretary of State, in his Letter dated the 8th September [1764]; by establishing this Post [Iberville] we shall run in Our Manufactures upon them in Spite of

⁵⁹ Romans, "An Attempt Towards a Short Description of West Florida," in *loc. cit.*, 124-25.

every Endeavour to the contrary."⁶⁰ From the early days of the colony Governor Johnstone had protested to the home government that if it would attract trade to West Florida, it must release the colony from some of the ordinary restrictions of the mercantile system.⁶¹ From time to time settlers from the colony who were in England testified to the Board of Trade as to the necessity of opening the West Florida ports. In 1767 Lieutenant Governor Browne made some overtures to the Spanish governor general at Havana upon trade matters.⁶²

The second discouraging factor, which actually handicapped the colony, was the Spanish control of New Orleans. The attempt to render the passage of the Iberville and Amite rivers navigable so that an entrance might be made into the Mississippi through the lakes had proved almost too difficult for achievement,⁶³ and the policy of the Spanish in New Orleans checked the British trade from Natchez and the Illinois country.⁶⁴ It is significant that the agitation against the close Spanish control of the river mouth began in the later sixties at the same time that the settlement at Natchez began to rise into prominence. Likewise New Orleans with its superior facilities and superior wealth dominated the trade of the Gulf coast to the detriment of Mobile and Pensacola. In the later sixties the settlers and army officers were talking of a Spanish war in which the first point of attack and conquest should be the port of New Orleans, which would give the British control of the lower Mississippi.⁶⁵ Had this proved to be the case, the British push would probably have continued westward in the future decades, for the movement to Natchez was but the first step upon the trail to Santa Fe.

⁶⁰ Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, 279-80.

⁶¹ P.R.O., C.O. 5/574, 575, 577. See also, Carter (ed.), *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage*, I, 305.

⁶² See Montfort Browne to the Lords of Trade, September 29, 1767, in P.R.O., C.O. 5/575.

⁶³ P.R.O., C.O. 5/574, 577, 583, 632. Some of these documents are printed in Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1776, English Dominion*, I, and in Alvord and Carter (eds.), *Collections of the Illinois State Historical Library, The British Series*, I, 216. Also consult the index in the last-named collection.

⁶⁴ See under "Commerce, Spanish"; "Trade"; "Illinois"; and "New Orleans," in the index of Carter (ed.), *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage*, I.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 285, 287-88, 290-92, 297, 300, 304, 305.

There was every indication in 1768-1770 that West Florida would become just such a wealthy and valuable colony as the Carolinas. Factional political strife had upset the province and the Indian menace was grave, but the natural produce of the colony was of the best and was increasing. Its western lands around Natchez, potentially "the most flourishing Country in his Majestys dominions,"⁶⁶ were opening up. In indigo, rice, furs, and fish, the colony had an increasing reputation and income. Trade with the trans-Mississippi Spanish territories along the Red River was on the increase. Political peace and military protection were necessary. The merchants of Pensacola and Mobile held indignation meetings in 1768 when the troops in West Florida were temporarily reduced.⁶⁷

A survey of the situation in West Florida between 1768 and 1770 shows that the colony had been built up to a remarkable degree during the first five years of British rule. The population, which up to 1768 had been largely tradesmen or men in the army and navy, was now receiving large accretions of civilians. The colony boasted sawmills, shipyards, shops, and farms. There were discouraging factors, there was political strife, but beside these there was the steady upgrowth of the economic life of the colony.

West Florida was the first British colony to be established west of the Appalachian mountains. Because of the stress laid by many historians upon the Ohio Valley and the Northwest this fact has been frequently overlooked. The fact that the colony went to Spain after the Revolution is a matter of government, not peoples, and made very little real difference in the course of the Anglo-American movement to the west. During the period of the Revolution it is not unlikely that the immigration of the Loyalists and "crackers" to West Florida, together with the colonizing efforts of Phineas Lyman's Company of Merchant Adventurers⁶⁸ on the Mississippi, constituted a rush into the

⁶⁶ See Montfort Browne's account of his journey to Natchez in 1768, in P.R.O., C.O. 5/577.

⁶⁷ Hamilton, *Colonial Mobile*, 262; also, Carter (ed.) *Correspondence of General Thomas Gage*, I, *passim*.

⁶⁸ The petition of Phineas Lyman is available in P.R.O., C.O. 5/577.

Old Southwest comparable, for a time at least, to that into the Old Northwest at an earlier period. Furthermore, this steady trickle of settlers into the Old Southwest never ceased until the country was settled. The breaking down of barriers of the proclamation at the time of the Revolution led in the days after 1783, when Spain claimed and held all this land in defiance of the treaty closing the War, to a further Anglo-American penetration of the Spanish frontier.⁶⁹

⁶⁹ This question is excellently handled by Lawrence Kinnaird, "American Penetration into Spanish Territory to 1803" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of California, 1928).

John Sharp Williams Becomes a United States Senator

BY GEORGE C. OSBORN

In 1907 John Sharp Williams sought a seat in the United States Senate—a position for which his previous background and training had admirably fitted him. He was born in Memphis, Tennessee, in 1854, and spent his boyhood in the heart of the South during the stirring days of the Civil War. Left an orphan by the death of his father at the battle of Shiloh, young Williams was reared at Cedar Grove plantation near Yazoo City, Mississippi, by his maternal grandmother. He was very fond of books from earliest childhood and received his first schooling at home.

Williams entered the University of the South at Sewanee, Tennessee, in 1870, but he was expelled from this institution a few months later. Subsequently he enrolled at the University of Virginia. Williams did not prove a brilliant student at the educational institution founded by Jefferson, perhaps because he had interests far deeper than the courses in which he was enrolled at the moment. As a member of the Jefferson Literary Society, he participated in many debates and in his senior year won the Society's medal as its best debater. After his graduation from the University of Virginia, he went abroad for two years of study at the University of Heidelberg and the College of Dijon. Upon returning from Europe, he decided to enter public life by way of law. In accordance with this decision he returned to Charlottesville in 1876, began the study of law, and received his degree at the end of a year's work.

After gaining admittance to the bar Williams practiced law in Memphis for a brief period. He was married in October, 1877, and subse-

quently moved to the old plantation home, Cedar Grove. He not only managed the plantation but also opened a law office in Yazoo City. Considerable time elapsed before he realized his ambition to enter a political career. He tried for the Democratic nomination from the fifth congressional district of Mississippi in 1890, but was defeated. In 1892 he was successful and began his career in the national House of Representatives at the beginning of Cleveland's second administration. That he rendered brilliant service in the House is attested by the fact that he was chosen minority leader in 1903. He had a difficult position, but he immediately set out to weld the House Democrats into a unit whose influence could be felt. Because of his success at this perplexing task, Williams was selected as temporary chairman of the Democratic convention in 1904 and delivered its keynote speech. His position in the House won him national recognition, and it was only natural that his race for the Senate in 1907 should attract the attention of the entire country.¹

Williams had long desired a seat in the Senate. He had even announced himself as a candidate in the summer of 1899 although he withdrew from the campaign before the finish.² He had to wait eight years before another opportunity presented itself. This time his opponent was Governor James K. Vardaman, a man who was not as widely known as Williams but whose eccentricities of manner and appearance made him a spectacular candidate.

Even then Mississippi had the equivalent of popular election of United States senators. Her constitution of 1890 sanctioned the election by the legislature, but the legislators merely recorded the opinions of the majority of their constituents.³ After 1902 a majority of the votes cast in a direct primary determined the action of the legislature. Because of an educational requirement for suffrage the primary was confined

¹ For information concerning the career of Williams before 1907, see George C. Osborn, "John Sharp Williams, Planter Statesman of the Deep South" (Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1938), 1-193.

² Natchez *Daily Democrat*, July 9, 1899.

³ Before 1902 the will of the people of the state was learned from instructions prepared in county conventions.

to white men, and, though spoken of as a Democratic primary, no successful method of preventing members of other parties from participating in the voting had been enacted into law. Seldom was a person's loyalty to the Democratic party questioned when he appeared at the polls. In 1907 the only requirements that were in force were that the voter must be a white man of legal age, residence, and registration. As a result of such a policy thousands of men voted in the Democratic primary who were either Republicans or supporters of Republican policies.

Under this plan of electing senators, Representative Williams and Governor Vardaman had to carry their fight before the people—each man hoping that he could enlist a majority of the voters of the state. The two candidates presented some interesting contrasts. Williams was a small man physically, a scholar who had been educated in American and foreign universities, with fifteen years of experience as a lawyer, and fourteen years of service in the national House of Representatives. The activities of his career had served to give him a national outlook on the problems of the day.

Vardaman was a much larger man physically. Usually he dressed in pure white and made a very striking figure with his heavy crop of coal black hair which hung to his shoulders. His veins were said to contain some Indian blood. Although not of the aristocracy born and possessed of but little formal education, Vardaman had climbed to the top in Mississippi politics. Admitted to the bar in 1881, he began the practice of law in Winona, Mississippi. Besides his law practice, an interest in newspaper work manifested itself when this enterprising young man became editor of the *Winona Advance*. He moved from Winona to Greenwood shortly before he was elected to the state legislature in 1890. He served in that body until 1896, acting as its speaker in 1894. The speakership failed to prove a stepping stone into the governor's chair when the lawyer-editor was defeated in 1895. During the Spanish-American War, at the age of thirty-seven Vardaman served as captain and then major in the Fifth United States Volunteer Infantry. He made a second campaign for the governorship in 1899 and was again de-

feated. A third attempt in 1903 made him governor,⁴ and in January of the following year he was inaugurated in a beautiful new capitol which had just been completed.⁵

Governor Vardaman's administration was not as radical on the race problem as the fact that he had gone into office on a platform of bitter hatred for the Negro would seem to indicate. In his inaugural address the Governor referred to his solution of the race problem—a solution which he was to make the leading issue of his campaign for the United States Senate three years later. He felt that the amendments to the Federal Constitution which gave the Negro rights as citizens had been a great mistake. "The nation should correct this error," he said, "this stupendous solecism, and now is the time to do it. . . . The Southern people should take the initiative. They are familiar with all the facts; they alone are capable of informing the world of the profound, God-stamped, time-fixed and unalterable incompetence of the negro for citizenship in a white man's country."⁶ The new Governor advocated the improvement of highways, encouragement of immigration and agriculture, investment of foreign capital, ample support of education for white children, and better care of Confederate veterans and their families.

Early in the administration two agricultural experiment stations were established in the state. Progress was made toward the conservation of natural resources and the preservation of wild life. A commission was appointed to codify Mississippi's laws. Another commission planned for the adoption of uniform textbooks for all public schools throughout the state. Under Vardaman's leadership a campaign was launched which resulted in stopping the then terrible menace of yellow fever. "Partisan politics should be absolutely eliminated from the penitentiary management," said the Governor. "The penitentiary farms . . . should be the model farms of the State. They should be used to demonstrate on a large scale the advantages to the farmers of experiments made at

⁴ *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928), 1647.

⁵ Dunbar Rowland, *History of Mississippi—The Heart of the South*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1925), II, 301.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 302.

the Agricultural and Mechanical College on a small scale.” George Creel summed up Vardaman’s term by saying that he “gave Mississippi the best administration in its history.”⁸ During Vardaman’s governorship Ray Stannard Baker made an extended visit to Mississippi and later wrote: “In spite of the bitterness against Vardaman among some of the best people of Mississippi I heard no one accuse him of corruption in any department of his administration. On the whole, they said he has directed the business of the state with judgment.”⁹

The campaign between Williams and Vardaman reflected some fundamental changes that had been wrought in the whole political and social structure of Mississippi since the Civil War. The abolition of slavery had done much to level the barriers between the aristocratic slaveholders and the poor whites. The lesser whites were coming into their own and what they lacked in education and traditional culture they possessed in energy and aggressiveness. The new, free education after the war carried the leveling process further. Most of the former aristocrats found themselves too poor to give their children the type of education which they themselves had obtained. Their children were forced to get what education they could in the public schools along with the children of the poorer whites. It began to seem that not a great deal of education was needed to succeed in politics. Democracy was having its way in Mississippi. In a sense at least, Williams and Vardaman typified the struggle between the old order and the new. Williams came of an aristocratic family and had received all the education and culture typical of his class. Vardaman, on the other hand, was to a considerable degree the champion of the rising common man.

The contest between the two men opened early in 1907. Both had announced themselves as senatorial candidates the year before.¹⁰ From the outset the fact was evident that Williams and Vardaman had very different ideas about what were the important issues of the contest.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 302-10.

⁸ George Creel, “The Carnival of Corruption in Mississippi,” in *Cosmopolitan Magazine* (New York, 1886-), LI (1911), 728.

⁹ Ray S. Baker, “The Negro in Politics,” in *American Magazine* (New York, 1876-), LXVI (1908), 172-73.

¹⁰ *Natchez Daily Democrat*, May 18, 1906.

Williams desired to stand on his Washington record. He hoped that the fight could be waged on issues of national importance such as the tariff and government ownership of railroads.¹¹ Vardaman came out solidly for government ownership.¹² Williams opposed the policy but soon found that the Governor was not going to spend much time discussing the matter. Vardaman laughed at Williams for thinking that the tariff was an important issue for Mississippi.¹³ From the beginning Vardaman insisted on keeping the Negro issue in the center of the political stage. Having ridden it into the Governor's mansion in 1903-1904, he now hoped that the same issue would take him to the United States Senate.¹⁴

The Governor's solution of the race problem was the one he had proposed in his inaugural in 1904: the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment to the Federal Constitution and the modification of the Fourteenth. Williams took the position that the repeal or revision of the Reconstruction amendments was absolutely impossible.¹⁵ He felt that nothing could be more perilous to a satisfactory settlement of the delicate race question than to make it the football of northern politicians in Washington. He wanted the South to control her own destiny. Many times during the campaign the Vardaman forces accused Williams of being the friend of the colored race.¹⁶ The report was circulated that Williams was trying to secure the registration of Negroes in order that they might vote in the primary. Williams emphatically replied: "Anybody who says that any negro has been registered at my instance or knowledge or would be is a liar. . . . I am no more in favor of voting negroes than Governor Vardaman and every man in the State of Mississippi who has sense enough to shake in a mustard shell knows that fact."¹⁷

¹¹ *Ibid.*, January 15, 1907.

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ *Jackson Daily News*, July 5, 1907.

¹⁴ *Jackson Evening News*, February 12, 1907; *Jackson Weekly Clarion Ledger*, February 14, 1907.

¹⁵ *Jackson Weekly Clarion Ledger*, February 14, 1907.

¹⁶ See the *Jackson Evening News*, May 5, 1907, for an excellent example.

¹⁷ Williams to Hunter Sharp Williams, Jackson, Miss., June 10, 1907. Although some of the Williams Papers remain at Cedar Grove, his plantation home in Yazoo County,

The Brookhaven *Leader* accused Williams of speaking at Hattiesburg and Poplarville when Negroes swarmed into the audience.¹⁸ The story grew out of the fact that when he spoke at court sessions in these two county seats, Negroes who were present merely remained during his address.¹⁹ Another time Williams was forced to deny the report that he had advocated a training school for Negroes. Vocational education would be "about the worst thing that could be given them" because it would bring "them into competition with white mechanics and artisans."²⁰ The fact is evident that no real fight could be waged on the race issue because both candidates were on the same side of the question although they differed on some minor points. All that Williams could do was to deny charges that he was the Negroes' friend and accuse Vardaman of being a demagogue for advocating anything so fantastic as the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment.

Williams' candidacy was backed by almost all of the daily papers of the state while the Governor could claim a larger per cent of the small country papers which seldom circulated out of the counties in which they were printed. The papers of one faction seldom quoted the statements and interviews of the opposition except for purposes of criticism.²¹

Many times before the campaign closed Williams deplored his lack of a political organization. He realized that he had no well-oiled machine while the Governor had the machinery of the state government behind him. Williams felt that his friends were "living in a sort of fool's paradise." They were boasting instead of doing serious work.²²

Mississippi, those used in this article, without exception, are in the Manuscripts Division of the Library of Congress. The author has used only initials in citing letters where that was done in the originals.

¹⁸ *Id.* to F. W. Foote, Jackson, Miss., June 10, 1907. The accusation was quoted in this letter. Williams did not give the date of the paper and the author has been unable to find any files of the Brookhaven *Leader*.

¹⁹ *Id.* to Hunter Sharp Williams, Jackson, Miss., June 10, 1907.

²⁰ *Id.* to Charles E. Hooker, Jr., Jackson, Miss., June 10, 1907.

²¹ These conclusions are obvious to one who has studied the files of the Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, the Jackson *Weekly Clarion Ledger*, the Jackson *Daily News*, the Jackson *Evening News*, and the Natchez *Daily Democrat*, during this period.

²² Williams to Wilson S. Hill, Yazoo City, Miss., May 4, 1907.

In an attempt to get more support from the farmers Williams requested that "as far as possible" all clubs organized in his behalf should elect farmers as presidents and vice-presidents.²³ Vardaman had been uniformly invited to address chapters of the Farmer's Union. He was posing as the friend of the one-mule farmer and proving it by frequently associating with him. His opponent did not receive a single invitation to appear before the organized farmers and he realized his unfortunate position. He tried to assure his friends that the "talk about the country people supporting Vardaman is just nonsense."²⁴ Williams was accused of being an aristocrat, born with a silver spoon in his mouth.²⁵ Vardaman campaign circulars claimed that their candidate was once a plow-boy, to which his opponent retorted: "I'll bet every dollar I have that if Jim Vardaman ever plowed he quit as soon as he could."²⁶

Williams stood on strong ground when he claimed that the contest was merely a matter of deciding which of the candidates could do the work of Mississippi better in the arena of the Senate.²⁷ He was convinced that his experience and training would make him a better servant of Mississippi's interests than *any* newcomer to Washington could possibly be.²⁸ In some degree, at least, Williams' record was an issue in the campaign. The opposition started a whispering campaign to the effect that he was anticipating the Democratic nomination for the presidency the next year.²⁹ On another occasion he was praised for his work as minority leader and the suggestion was made that if the Democrats should gain control of the House in 1908 Williams would become speaker, hence he should remain in the House. The Vardaman forces saw that these arguments were helping more than they were hurting and began to declare that Williams had "done nothing." To meet this challenge Williams and his friends adopted the question, "What has Williams done?" and marshalled such an array of facts to reveal his

²³ *Id.* to J. C. McNeill, Yazoo City, Miss., June 3, 1907.

²⁴ *Id.* to N. T. Curtis, Jackson, Miss., June 10, 1907.

²⁵ *Natchez Daily Bulletin*, quoted in *Jackson Daily News*, July 13, 1907.

²⁶ *Ibid.*

²⁷ Williams to J. E. Warnock, Washington, D. C., February 9, 1907.

²⁸ *Id.* to S. J. Creekmore, Washington, D. C., February 12, 1907.

²⁹ *Jackson Evening News*, January 2, 1907.

accomplishments that the opposition backed down.⁸⁰ Their rout was only temporary, however, and soon they returned to their old psychology. The Governor should be elected senator, the people were told by the opponents of Williams, to retain him in office. The Congressman would be retained in the national House of Representatives even if defeated in his race for the Senate. Williams realized the danger of the suggestion and declared that he would not wait for Mississippi to show him a second time that she did not want his service. If the state should elect Vardaman, he would retire from Congress. "I wish you would impress it upon your people," wrote the Congressman, "that a vote for Vardaman does not mean to continue Vardaman *and* me in the public service. It means to retire me and continue him."⁸¹

At the beginning of the campaign Williams challenged his opponent to a series of joint debates.⁸² The invitation was completely ignored by the Governor until late in the campaign. His forces defended his refusal on the ground that the official business of the state would keep him so busily engaged until midsummer that he would not have the opportunity of making an extended list of speaking engagements.⁸³ Late in April both candidates were invited to Greenville to speak before the local chapter of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. For a time it seemed that the long-sought joint debate would materialize, but it did not.⁸⁴ On several occasions when the two men were to speak at the same place on the same day Vardaman appeared, made his speech, and departed before his opponent arrived. In all his challenges Williams insisted upon a real joint debate with rejoinders by both men.

When Williams challenged Vardaman to a joint debate at Meridian on July 4, pressure was brought to bear on the Governor by his friends. The excuse that the Governor's business was so pressing that he could not engage in a joint debate did not seem consistent when he was mak-

⁸⁰ See Natchez *Daily Democrat*, April 30, 1907; Jackson *Weekly Clarion Ledger*, May 16, 1907; Jackson *Daily News*, May 16, 1907; Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, July 11, 1907.

⁸¹ Williams to Thomas Spight, Yazoo City, Miss., May 27, 1907.

⁸² Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, January 24, 1907.

⁸³ Jackson *Weekly Clarion Ledger*, February 28, 1907.

⁸⁴ Jackson *Evening News*, April 28, 29, June 13, 1907; Natchez *Daily Democrat*, June 13, 1907.

ing several speeches over the state each week. The Williams forces began to accuse Vardaman of being afraid to meet their candidate on the stump. Debates between candidates for the Senate had been customary in Mississippi. The press began to insist that the people of the state expected and demanded a joint debate between Williams and Vardaman. Unable to withstand the pressure any longer, the Governor agreed to meet his opponent at Meridian.⁸⁵

The attention of the entire state was turned towards Meridian on July 4. Fully twenty thousand visitors thronged the city, and papers throughout the South had reporters present. The speakers were late because the Governor had contended to the last for the privilege of making his speech first. He did not want a rejoinder.⁸⁶ Apparently he wanted to depart upon the conclusion of his speech.

Williams opened the debate by renewing his almost daily invitations to the Governor to meet him in a series of joint debates during the rest of the campaign. He stated emphatically his belief that any attempt to repeal amendments to the Constitution would be absolutely futile. Handing the Governor a copy of the Constitution and a pencil, he requested that his opponent should modify the Fourteenth Amendment as he would do when he reached the Senate. Williams further embarrassed the Governor by reading a letter which the latter had written in 1903 in which he testified to the ability and character of the former and predicted Williams would "one day rank with the great Senators of America."⁸⁷ Then Representative Williams spent most of his two hours discussing some of the national problems of the day.

⁸⁵ Jackson *Weekly Clarion Ledger*, June 27, 1907.

⁸⁶ The facts in regard to the joint debate in Meridian were secured from the files of the Jackson *Daily News*, July 5-7, 1907; Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, July 5-7, 1907; and Natchez *Daily Democrat*, July 5-7, 1907. Each of these papers had a reporter present. See also, Frederick Palmer, "Williams vs. Vardaman at Meridian," in *Collier's Weekly*, July 27, 1907. Palmer wrote as a member of the audience.

⁸⁷ James K. Vardaman to Charles C. Elliot, Greenwood, Miss., September 25, 1903, quoted in Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, July 18, 1907. In a speech made before the Mississippi Democratic Convention of 1904, Williams said of Vardaman's administration as governor: "There is not a State in the Union better governed, not a state that has a more upright, honorable and conscientious executive, judiciary, and legislature." See Natchez *Daily Democrat*, June 16, 1904.

Most of the Governor's speech was taken up with a bitter recounting of stories of Negro crimes and the suggestion that Williams was trying to obscure the main issue—the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment—by talking about other issues. To establish this point government ownership was brought up. "I have here before me," declared the Governor, "a speech in which Mr. Bryan declares that government ownership is not an issue in the program of the Democratic Party."

"Show me the speech," promptly demanded Williams.

After a few minutes of fumbling among his notes, the Governor said: "I thought I had it but I haven't."

"Then tell me where he made the speech," demanded Williams.

Vardaman became embarrassed, turned a livid red, and stammered that Bryan had made it when in Jackson in the executive mansion.

"Oh, then it was not a public utterance," commented Williams.

A few minutes later, the Governor pretended to be quoting a newspaper clipping of a speech Williams had made the preceding fall in Parkersburg, West Virginia. He had read only a few lines when Williams interrupted him:

"Let me see the paper."

Reluctantly the Governor granted the request.

"There is no such article here," announced Williams.

Vardaman argued that the Mississippi constitution of 1890 was not sufficient to keep the Negro disfranchised. He brought up the question of final political power as vested in the voting population of the state. He contended that people vested with the right of suffrage could change anything in the government that they might desire to change.³⁸

Williams spent his rejoinder showing how the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment would do nothing to eradicate the Negro crimes which the Governor had recounted. He assured his audience that Mississippi was keeping the Negro out of politics and was perfectly safeguarded in that respect by her own constitution. The Governor's rejoinder was interrupted when he attempted to quote his opponent. Williams had

³⁸ Herbert L. McCleskey, "The Public Career of John Sharp Williams" (M.A. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1933), 28.

stated near the end of his speech that he would give his left hand to secure the repeal of the Fifteenth Amendment. The Governor exclaimed: "Mr. Williams stated that he would give his right hand to secure repeal—"

"Hold on," shouted a man from the crowd. "Williams said his 'left hand'; quote him correctly." After regaining his composure, the Governor dwelt the rest of his time on the efforts he had made since he became governor to keep the Negro from securing any of the state funds for education.

Vardaman claimed publicly that he did not receive a square deal at Meridian. He was provoked because his request for a speech with no rejoinder was not agreed to, and because he had been interrupted when he attempted to answer his opponent. He went so far as to claim that all the press reports of the occasion had been censored in the interest of Williams, an accusation for which there was apparently no proof.³⁹ At any rate, Governor Vardaman absolutely ignored all challenges for joint debate which his opponent issued during the rest of the campaign.

Throughout the contest there had been much out-of-state interest manifested in its course. Williams' record in Congress, particularly as Democratic minority leader, had caught the interest of the nation. Vardaman, unique in appearance, had attracted national curiosity by his fiery speeches against Negroes and his demand for repeal of the post-war amendments. Senator Samuel McEnery of Louisiana declared through a press interview that if Williams would make his home in Louisiana he would resign his seat in his favor.⁴⁰ Letters came to the Mississippi papers from all over the country urging the nomination of Williams,⁴¹ but Tom Watson of Georgia, leader of the Populists of the South, wrote letters into Mississippi urging the support of the Governor. The Georgia leader predicted that should Williams "win out in the fight with Governor Vardaman the corporations would have just

³⁹ Jackson *Daily News*, July 7, 1907. The *News* labeled this statement of Vardaman's as "The Governor's Baby Act."

⁴⁰ Quoted in Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, July 25, 1907.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*

one more doodle bug in the United States Senate."⁴² *Watson's Magazine* was circulated as campaign literature by the Vardaman headquarters.

On the evening of July 31 both factions held big political rallies in Jackson.⁴³ The next day the primary occurred. The weather was ideal. The Governor's faction, which was stronger with the country voters, was favored. The *Jackson Daily News* claimed on August 2 that Williams was nominated by at least 12,000 majority; the *Natchez Daily Democrat* on the same day stated that Mississippi stood redeemed, and indicated in large headlines that the returns from the primary had given a "Landslide for Williams." On August 3, however, these papers presented quite different figures. Now the *Daily Democrat* stated that returns from sixty-four counties gave Vardaman a majority of 162. The *Daily News*, while admitting gains for the Governor, continued to claim Williams' nomination by at least one thousand majority. As late as August 5 the headquarters of both candidates were claiming a victory—each by a majority of over fifteen hundred votes.⁴⁴

On the night of August 2 an unusual celebration occurred at the Governor's mansion. A crowd of several thousand people assembled in front of the building and demanded the Governor's presence. In answer to this request of his friends the "White Chief" made a victory address from the front porch. After the address the crowd rushed to the porch to shake hands with the supposed victor. Instantly the parlors and halls of the mansion were overflowing with surging masses of elated Mississippians. The Governor was "cheered for thirty minutes."⁴⁵

By August 5 some friends of the Governor were talking of having recounts in several counties, the returns of which had been contrary to their anticipations.⁴⁶ Reports of fraud were widely circulated. Williams' headquarters sent out a request to election managers, advising that they

⁴² *Ibid.*, August 1, 1907; also in *Jackson Daily News*, July 26, 1907.

⁴³ *Jackson Daily News*, August 1, 1907; *Jackson Daily Clarion Ledger*, August 1, 1907.

⁴⁴ *Jackson Daily News*, August 2-5, 1907; also *Natchez Daily Democrat*, August 1-5, 1907.

⁴⁵ *Natchez Daily Democrat*, August 3, 1907. The *Jackson Daily News* carried no account of this outburst of affection for Williams' opponent.

⁴⁶ *Natchez Daily Democrat*, August 6, 1907; *Jackson Daily News*, August 5, 1907.

should not let the ballots nor the original tally sheets get out of their hands.⁴⁷ The rumored recount did not materialize. The press reported the burning of ballots in Copiah, Simpson, and Tallahatchie counties, all of which had given Vardaman substantial majorities.⁴⁸

The outcome of the primary was in doubt until the Democratic State Executive Committee met in the hall of the House of Representatives on the morning of August 8.⁴⁹ The honesty and reputation of the white Democrats of Mississippi were at stake. Regardless of which was officially decided to be the nominee, many of the leading citizens of the state recognized the gravity of the situation. It must not be said that the Democratic party of Mississippi could not conduct an honest election. The Executive Committee carefully examined and tabulated the returns from all counties, accepting unofficial returns from Monroe, Smith, Kemper, and Grenada counties that had not sent in official returns. After the conclusion of the tabulation the chairman of the Executive Committee announced that John Sharp Williams had been nominated for the United States Senate by a majority of 648 out of the total of 118,344 votes cast. Governor Vardaman accepted the arbitrament with the statement that he wanted his friends to feel as he did: "We have not been defeated, but victory is only postponed for a season."⁵⁰ His prophecy proved true because four years later he was chosen as junior Senator and became Williams' colleague.

The Democratic primary of 1907 was a severe test of the direct primary system in Mississippi.⁵¹ In this state, as in other southern states which have but one party actively engaged in politics, nomination in the primary is equivalent to election. This statement is so utterly true that after the primary is over no further campaigning is ever done. In the general election in November only 25 to 40 per cent of the vote

⁴⁷ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, August 6, 1907; Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, August 8, 1907.

⁴⁸ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, August 7, 1907; Jackson *Daily News*, August 7, 1907.

⁴⁹ For accounts of the situation, report on the State Democratic Executive Committee meeting, et cetera, see Jackson *Daily News*, August 7-8, 1907; Natchez *Daily Democrat*, August 8, 1907; Jackson *Daily Clarion Ledger*, August 7-9, 1907.

⁵⁰ Natchez *Daily Democrat*, August 9, 1907.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*

cast in the August primary is ever recorded. The Mississippi constitution, as did the Federal Constitution at that time, required that the legislative body elect the United States senators. In keeping with that provision, the legislators in session on January 12, 1908, duly elected Williams to the United States Senate for a term of six years beginning on March 4, 1911. Williams was present at the joint meeting of the two houses and formally accepted the election with an address appropriate to the occasion.

The senatorial campaign of 1907 had one very important result for Mississippi and the country. It gave John Sharp Williams an opportunity to go to the Senate where his splendid training and outstanding abilities were sorely needed and where he rendered distinguished service for twelve years.

Notes and Documents

THE SOUTH AND THE PROGRESSIVE LILY WHITE PARTY OF 1912

By GEORGE E. MOWRY

When by accident Theodore Roosevelt came to the presidency in 1901, he entered that office with a desire to revise the political map of the country, for he was positive that a change in the traditional Republican attitude toward the southern white voter would go far to break the Democratic political monopoly of the solid South. Accordingly, in his early appointments and in his public speeches he attempted to pursue a course of conciliation calculated to entice the white citizen of the South away from the Democratic party. At the time his hopes ran high that a good many white men who differed with Bryan radicalism and with Democratic low tariff doctrine would become Republican in name as well as in dogma. In the early years of his administration he even half decided that the entire section's political disposition was responding to his blandishments. But because of a series of mistakes in political strategy and because of the traditional southern abhorrence of "Black Republicanism," he was unable through the course of seven years to effect much change in either the color or the numbers of the Republican party in the South.¹

After his departure from the Republican party in June of 1912, however, Roosevelt realized at once that perhaps this was his chance to break the political monopoly of states below the Ohio River by organizing a rival party designed to appeal to southern whites. Nor was this

¹ Joseph B. Bishop, *Theodore Roosevelt and His Time*, 2 vols. (New York, 1920), I, 154-57, 351; Mark Sullivan, *Our Times, The United States, 1900-1925*, 6 vols. (New York, 1926-1935), III, 139.

judgment, which undoubtedly influenced him to leave his old party, founded purely upon philosophical speculation.

In the decade following the end of the century the South had made great industrial strides. During these ten years the steel production of the southern portion of the country had almost doubled.² Textiles and other industrial activities had followed the way of steel. And as a new industrial leadership began to find a more important voice in southern society, vigorous protests were heard from the section against the radical agrarian leadership of the Democratic party as well as against its traditional low tariff doctrine. Roosevelt himself was kept constantly aware of this protest as numerous letters from sometime Democrats arrived at Oyster Bay to emphasize the point. "Our people are sick of the Democratic method and Democratic control," wrote one representative of this feeling in the South. But most of all, southern industrial leadership was sick because there was no party with a defined policy "calculated to command the support of that class of businessmen of the South who naturally want to vote the Republican ticket" if the name *Republican* wasn't above that ticket.³ It was upon this discontent that Theodore Roosevelt proposed to found the Progressive party in the South, which, freed of the incubus of the Republican label, would be "without one touch of sectional feeling," and which therefore could offer the first serious opposition to southern Democracy since the days of the old Whigs.⁴

But long before an efficient Progressive organization was built in the South, the new party and its leader ran squarely against the problem of the Negro. For many colored people on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line, induced into the belief that the Progressive platform held forth social justice to all men, hastened to join the party. That, indeed, presented a problem. It was undeniably true that the underprivileged Negro in the North would constitute a considerable element

² Harold U. Faulkner, *The Quest for Social Justice, 1898-1914* (New York, 1931), 9.

³ George N. Wise to Theodore Roosevelt, June 29, 1912; Jeter C. Pritchard to *id.*, December 7, 1911; A. M. Beatty to George W. Perkins, April 27, 1912, Roosevelt MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁴ Roosevelt to Thomas S. Forsyth, July 27, 1912, *ibid.*

of support for any reform party. In fact, it was due largely to Negro support that Roosevelt had beaten Taft in the Maryland primary held in the spring of 1912.⁵ Yet the leader of the Progressive party was well aware that if a strong, permanent party were to be built in the South it would necessarily have to be organized upon a "lily white" basis. If he entertained any doubts about the matter they were resolved when letters from his southern lieutenants demanded that he support the movement for white supremacy within the proposed party.⁶

Roosevelt, however, perceived that to make a public announcement, as he had been urged to do, to the effect that he was in favor of white supremacy would immediately alienate most of his black support from the North. He could not abide that thought. And so while instructing his southern leaders to follow "that formula best designed for party success," he himself followed his own advice of a year before by saying as little as possible upon the subject.⁷ A short time later it was announced from Oyster Bay that each state organization would have to settle all such problems for itself.⁸ That equivocal decision, however, did not prevent Senator Joseph M. Dixon, Roosevelt's national campaign manager, from publicly disavowing the only movement started for the Colonel in South Carolina purely because it was a black organization. "We knew that meant suicide," Senator Dixon said later before the National Committee.⁹ Taking this somewhat evasive, but nevertheless definite, stand in the South, Roosevelt characteristically hastened to clear his skirts in the North. He soon wrote to friends that he was busy "earnestly asking" northern Progressive leaders to bring along with them to the Chicago Convention a few Negro delegates.¹⁰

If Roosevelt hoped to settle the question with this bit of adroit ma-

⁵ Charles J. Bonaparte to Charles C. Kidder, October 30, 1912, Bonaparte MSS. (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

⁶ Cecil A. Lyon to Roosevelt, July 13, 1912; John M. Parker to *id.*, July 12, 1912; Roosevelt to Bradley Gilman, July 24, 1912, Roosevelt MSS.

⁷ Roosevelt to Parker, July 15, 1912; *id.* to Francis W. Dawson, October 20, 1911, *ibid.*

⁸ *Atlanta Journal*, July 28, 1912; *Charlotte Daily Observer*, July 28, 1912.

⁹ Proceedings of the Provisional Progressive National Committee, August 3, 1912, pp. 11, 12, Roosevelt MSS. Cited hereafter as Proceedings.

¹⁰ Roosevelt to Gilman, July 24, 1912; *id.* to William A. Maxwell, July 30, 1912, Roosevelt MSS.

neuvering, the South soon proved him wrong. In Georgia, when the officially blessed Roosevelt Georgia White League called a state convention to select delegates, the call made it clear that no colored people would be admitted. Thereupon a Negro faction, naming itself the National Progressive party, held a second convention and selected a contesting delegation which it threatened to send to Chicago.¹¹

With a view to avoiding such embarrassing contests, H. L. Anderson, who had been appointed provisional national committeeman for Florida, organized and subsidized two conventions, one white and one black. Anderson then forgot to tell the colored people that their convention would meet over a hundred miles away from the white gathering and that being so inconveniently placed it would have no voice in the selection of delegates or in the organization of the state machine. When the colored convention met in Florida only to find itself a debating society, it angrily disregarded Anderson's paid Negro lieutenants and selected, as in the case of Georgia, a full slate of contesting delegates to attend the National Convention.¹² And what had happened in Georgia and Florida was substantially repeated in Alabama and Mississippi.¹³

To add to the embarrassment of Roosevelt and his party, not only did these black conventions select delegates to the National Convention, but upon the meeting of the Provisional Progressive National Committee on August 3 in Chicago the Negro delegates from Florida, Mississippi, and Alabama were so inconsiderate as actually to appear, ready to contest the seating of the white delegations. Thus, there was nothing to do except to face publicly the issue and answer it.

Meeting at the Congress Hotel in Chicago, the committee whose task it was to decide the contests and to make a permanent roll, wrestled for the better part of three days and three nights with the matter. Most of the first day was spent in hearing the testimony bearing on the controversies. Thereafter through long weary hours the committee heatedly

¹¹ *Atlanta Journal*, July 17, 18, 20, 24, 1912; *New York Times*, July 25, 1912.

¹² *Proceedings*, August 3, 1912, pp. 82-83, 95, 212-13.

¹³ *New Orleans Times Democrat*, July 25, 1912.

debated the points at issue. And for the most part, with some exceptions, the justice of the Negro's case rarely entered the discussion. Instead, patience grew short and temper flashed around the problem of political expediency. As the national committeeman from Massachusetts put it, the whole problem before the committee centered around the question of "whether our action here is going to hurt Colonel Roosevelt's candidacy, or whether it is going to help it."¹⁴

In the meantime, Roosevelt, informed that the whole question was to be forced before the public eye, and possibly fearing that the National Committee would take some rash action on the matter, decided that he could no longer sit on the fence with profit. So, writing a long public letter to Julian Harris,¹⁵ he defined his position on the subject and intimated strongly to the National Committee the solution he desired.

Roosevelt opened his letter by saying that he had been urged by northern men to insist upon racial equality in the South and equally urged by Southerners to stand unqualifiedly for a white man's party in all sections. He was not able, he declared, "to agree to either proposal."

For, Roosevelt continued cleverly, the political and social position of the Negro in the North and that of his brother in the South was not at all alike. In the North there were numerous intelligent and honest Negroes who could be incorporated into the party machinery to the mutual good of both the individual and the party. In these states, where the Republican party had long disregarded the Negro, the Progressives had recognized the colored man immediately, he pointed out, even to the extent of selecting some of the race as delegates to the National Convention.

The situation in the South, however, was a different matter. In this opinion, Roosevelt declared, he stood not on theory but upon actual observation. For forty-five years the Republican party had been trying to build a successful organization there based upon black participation,

¹⁴ Proceedings, August 5, 1912, p. 212.

¹⁵ Roosevelt to Julian Harris, August 1, 1912, Roosevelt MSS. Significantly, this letter to the son of "Uncle Remus" was not released to the press until August 3, the day on which the National Committee began its deliberations.

and the result for a variety of reasons had been "lamentable from every standpoint." It had been productive of evil to the colored man, to the white man, to the section, and finally to the party. To repeat that experiment, he felt, would make a Progressive victory impossible in the South, and would do nothing for the Negro except "to create another impotent little corrupt faction of would-be office holders, of delegates whose expenses had to be paid, and whose votes sometimes had to be bought."

In conclusion, he maintained that the only man who could help the Negro in the South was his white neighbor; and therefore he hoped that the Progressive party would put the leadership in the South into the hands of "intelligent and benevolent" white men who would see to it that the Negro got a measure of justice, something which the Northerner could not obtain for him, and something which he could not obtain for himself.¹⁶ Thus, Charles Sumner and Thaddeus Stevens were publicly disavowed by a former Republican President.

But even with this blueprint to guide the committee, Roosevelt was still worried about its final decision on the question. Throughout its long deliberations he remained in his room directly above the committee meeting. From that point of vantage he intently watched the whole course of the debate and carefully advised and instructed his lieutenants below.¹⁷

The committee, naturally, took up for decision only the contests in the states from which rival delegations had actually put in their appearance. Among these perhaps the case of Florida provoked the warmest discussion. As was fitting and proper, Matthew Hale, the national committeeman from Massachusetts, the old seat of abolitionism, led the debate. In regard to Florida, where Anderson admitted he had "duped"

¹⁶ *Ibid.* In a public reply Harris agreed with everything Roosevelt had said. Not forgetting the circumstances which prompted Roosevelt to this action or the fact that he himself had "lived" with and had at times even used "the little corrupt faction" without attempting any reform, it is still the considered opinion of the writer that Roosevelt's letter of over a dozen pages represents the most intelligent public statement dealing with this problem of the South by any erstwhile Republican politician since Abraham Lincoln.

¹⁷ Proceedings, August 5, 1912, p. 234.

the Negro, Hale maintained that the point at debate did not involve race at all, but rather a "question of common honesty."¹⁸ Viewed in that light, Hale concluded, he could not vote to seat the white delegation. When it became apparent that such sentiments were held by a good many northern members, a compromise was suggested which would seat both delegations but which granted power to vote only to the white delegation.

Immediately upon the suggestion of the compromise the Southerners were on their feet objecting to the seating of colored men from the South. "In the case of Georgia, if you seat a negro delegation, you might as well give it up," protested Julian Harris.¹⁹ And when chairman Anderson himself declared that he would rather see both delegations barred than to see a Florida Negro on the convention floor, the committee decided to allow Georgia to go unrepresented. Anderson, however, was to continue as national committeeman.²⁰

Again in the case of Mississippi the debate did not center around the justice of white supremacy, but rather around the means of obtaining it. The objection of the North was to the nature of the call for the state convention, which Benjamin F. Fridge, the national committeeman, had so worded as to exclude colored people automatically. After a long debate in which Hale's motion to unseat the Mississippi delegation was not supported, a compromise was found which again secured the substance of white supremacy without officially acknowledging it. The committee agreed by a vote of twenty-two to twelve to seat the white delegation; it also officially disavowed the call containing the word "white."²¹

This continual dodging of an open statement of policy was not at all to the appetite of the southern leaders. The least they wanted, as John M. Parker of Louisiana had stated at the beginning of the debate, was a statement which could be "understood in the South" as a decla-

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 213.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 230.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 240.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 264. The contests of the Alabama Negroes were decided with little debate against them.

ration that the party was and would be a white man's party to whose primaries only white men could come.²² To such a frank statement the northern leaders, representing states with a large Negro electorate, were unalterably opposed. "I could not sit in a convention that would be designated as a white man's party," shouted William Flinn of Pennsylvania.²³

Flinn and his fellow delegates from the North were not against the essence of white supremacy in the South; in fact, they agreed to a man that this was the only expedient policy to pursue. But they did care a great deal about the way it was presented to the public and especially to the northern colored voter. They approved of the contents of the bottle but objected to the label. In the words of Hale, Roosevelt's letter to Harris, stripped of its verbiage, simply said to the Negro, "Get out of here, we don't want you." But with the verbiage, Hale contended, the letter was a "masterpiece." "It is going to be very hard for a great many northern men to swallow it even in that sugar coated form," he added, "but we can do it."²⁴

Finally, after a long debate and after the personal intercession of Roosevelt, the southern delegates agreed to a compromise in the form of two resolutions: the first, offered by Francis J. Heney, approved the position taken by Roosevelt in his letter to Harris; the second further insured white domination without stating it by giving to the organizations in states without primaries the power to decide irrevocably all such contests.²⁵ On the same day the convention, which had been awaiting the findings of the committee, adopted its report, including the two resolutions, without debate.²⁶ Subsequently Roosevelt attempted to appease the anger of the northern Negro at this cavalier treatment of the southern Negro. Midway in his speech of acceptance the Colonel departed from the written version to restate his position on the problem

²² *Ibid.*, August 3, 1912, p. 51.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Ibid.*, August 5, 1912, p. 220.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 265-66.

²⁶ Official Minutes of the First Progressive National Convention, August 6, 1912, pp. 141-42, Roosevelt MSS.

and to heap five minutes of fulsome, almost sticky praise upon the northern Negro.²⁷

Unfortunately for the Progressive cause, Roosevelt's letter to Harris and his later elaborations during the convention did not serve to down the question or to answer the queries of Negroes from the northern side of Mason and Dixon's line. The *New York Times* reported that within two weeks after the Progressive convention the majority of Negro editors who had once been favorably disposed toward Roosevelt were now decidedly against him.²⁸ But Roosevelt did not have to consult the press for confirmation of this swing. His own correspondence bore violent testimony of it. Negroes, Negro sympathizers, and old abolitionists all wrote to him voicing their protests. He was told that the Progressive party had out-Heroded Herod in the zeal with which it broke the Fifteenth Amendment, and that he personally had been fooling the Negro all of his life merely for political gain.²⁹

Nor could the Colonel's ancient bedeviler, the press, pass up the chance to attack him. From the North and from the South Roosevelt was flayed with book, bell, and candle for his "obvious straddling" of the issue. One southern journal asserted that he had already ruined the Progressive movement in the South by his creation of a "black and white" Bull Moose.³⁰ Only in a very few instances was he praised editorially as a North Carolina paper praised him for being "courageous" enough to recognize conditions in the South as they really existed.³¹

When the November election neared, this editorial attack, especially in the South, grew more heated and bitter. In an effort to keep the section Democratic, southern journals rang the changes upon Roosevelt's past relations with the Negro. They reminded the South that after all the Progressive party was a black party since it acknowledged

²⁷ *Chicago Tribune*, August 7, 1912.

²⁸ *New York Times*, August 26, 1912.

²⁹ Louis Edleman to Roosevelt, August 6, 1912; Flavel S. Luther to *id.*, August 8, 1912; Robert S. Hartgrove to *id.*, August 10, 1912; Roosevelt to Floyd R. DuBois, August 26, 1912, Roosevelt MSS.

³⁰ *New York Times*, August 18, 1912; *Atlanta Journal*, August 18, 1912; *New Orleans Times Democrat*, August 4, 1912.

³¹ *Charlotte Daily Observer*, August 10, 1912.

the right of the Negro to sit in the party's councils in the North. They pointed back to the years when Roosevelt had regularly appointed Negroes to office in the South over the "earnest protests" of the community, and back to the Booker T. Washington affair. Finally, on the eve of the election the story that Theodore Roosevelt had just taken dinner with two Negroes in the Narragansett Hotel in Providence, Rhode Island, was triumphantly plastered over Democratic journals to prove that all they had said about the former President and the Negro was not sufficiently condemnatory for the present occasion.³² Small wonder then that after the campaign was over the crestfallen object of these attacks should write to a friend: "Ugh! There is not any more puzzling problem in this country than the problem of color."³³

Roosevelt had ample basis, furthermore, for the above remark in the electoral returns. An analysis of election statistics from thirteen states comprising the South indicated that the Progressive party had utterly failed in its attempt even to dent this section. The Progressives had polled far fewer votes than had the Republican party in 1904 and 1908, and had polled only a few thousand more than the hapless Taft. Roosevelt's margin over Taft was far greater in the North than it was in the South. The solid South was still the solid South and from the returns of 1912 it gave every indication of remaining so.

The crushing defeat of the Progressive party in the South was not wholly unexpected by the political wisemen. Roosevelt's former connection with the Republican party was undoubtedly a factor of some weight; for the tradition-bound South, then as now, was more of an emotional attitude than it was a political party. The personal strength of Woodrow Wilson, southern born and southern trained, also contributed to the defeat. And the high tariff program of the Progressive party could hardly have made an effective appeal to the agrarian portions of the section, save, of course, to the sugar area.

But the greatest anomaly of the Progressive campaign in the South was its attempted appeal to the rising manufacturing interests. On first

³² *Atlanta Journal*, October 16, 27, 31, November 1, 3, 1912; *Raleigh News and Observer*, November 3, 1912.

³³ Roosevelt to James B. Matthews, January 7, 1913, Roosevelt MSS.

sight the high protective tariff plank might have attracted southern factory owners; but a closer inspection of the radical Progressive platform with its demands for social justice, for regulated hours and regulated wages, must have repelled them even faster than it did identical economic classes in the North. By axiom a new master class is always more stoutly conservative than one mellowed with time. And the South was, and is, no exception to that rule.

By the exigencies of the evolution of party politics, Roosevelt and his fellow Progressives in 1912 were forced to fashion a political organization from disaffected Republicans, a fact which necessitated a platform squarely centered upon a high protective tariff plank. Moreover, for the same reason the new party, if it were to succeed at all, had to be a repository for the most advanced blueprints of social reform, reform which significantly looked away from agrarian liberalism and toward a full-blown social democracy. And thus the Progressive party, even with its somewhat northern begrimed lily-white basis, had little to offer to a section whose liberalism was in the tradition of the Populists and whose industrial conservatism had only reached the age of headstrong adolescence.

REVOLUTIONARY DIARY OF WILLIAM LENOIR

Edited by J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

The little diary here printed was found among the numerous papers¹ of the Lenoir family of "Fort Defiance" in Happy Valley, Caldwell County, North Carolina. William Lenoir,² who wrote it, was born in Brunswick County, Virginia, May 20, 1751. Brought as a child to Edgecombe County, North Carolina, he there grew to manhood, acquiring little formal education, but developing steadily the qualities which were to make him one of the outstanding figures of his day in North Caro-

¹ Several years ago these papers came into the possession of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

² A sketch of William Lenoir by Samuel A. Ashe is available in *Biographical History of North Carolina*, 8 vols. (Greensboro, 1905-1917), II, 219-21.

sight the high protective tariff plank might have attracted southern factory owners; but a closer inspection of the radical Progressive platform with its demands for social justice, for regulated hours and regulated wages, must have repelled them even faster than it did identical economic classes in the North. By axiom a new master class is always more stoutly conservative than one mellowed with time. And the South was, and is, no exception to that rule.

By the exigencies of the evolution of party politics, Roosevelt and his fellow Progressives in 1912 were forced to fashion a political organization from disaffected Republicans, a fact which necessitated a platform squarely centered upon a high protective tariff plank. Moreover, for the same reason the new party, if it were to succeed at all, had to be a repository for the most advanced blueprints of social reform, reform which significantly looked away from agrarian liberalism and toward a full-blown social democracy. And thus the Progressive party, even with its somewhat northern begrimed lily-white basis, had little to offer to a section whose liberalism was in the tradition of the Populists and whose industrial conservatism had only reached the age of headstrong adolescence.

REVOLUTIONARY DIARY OF WILLIAM LENOIR

Edited by J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON

The little diary here printed was found among the numerous papers¹ of the Lenoir family of "Fort Defiance" in Happy Valley, Caldwell County, North Carolina. William Lenoir,² who wrote it, was born in Brunswick County, Virginia, May 20, 1751. Brought as a child to Edgecombe County, North Carolina, he there grew to manhood, acquiring little formal education, but developing steadily the qualities which were to make him one of the outstanding figures of his day in North Caro-

¹ Several years ago these papers came into the possession of the Southern Historical Collection of the University of North Carolina.

² A sketch of William Lenoir by Samuel A. Ashe is available in *Biographical History of North Carolina*, 8 vols. (Greensboro, 1905-1917), II, 219-21.

lina. There he married Ann Ballard of Halifax County, and shortly thereafter, in March, 1775, he went to Surry County (now Wilkes) and settled at Mulberry Field Meeting House, in what is now the town of Wilkesboro. Later he built a home, "Fort Defiance," in Happy Valley, which has ever since been the seat of the family.

Lenoir played an important part in the state for the remainder of his life. In 1777 the new county of Wilkes was created and he was appointed a justice of the peace and held that office for sixty years. He was also, in succession, register surveyor, commissioner of affidavits, chairman of the county court, and clerk of the superior court of the county. He rose through all the grades of military service and finally served for eighteen years as general of militia. Lenoir was a member of the state Senate from 1787 to 1795 and its president from 1791. He served two terms, 1808-1809, on the Council of State and was chosen its president. He was a delegate to the convention of 1788, which refused to ratify the Constitution of the United States, and to that of 1789, which accepted it. As a member of the legislature of the same year, he was active in securing the charter of the University of North Carolina and was chosen a member of the board of trustees on which he served until 1804 and of which he was president for the first two years of its existence. A successful business man, he amassed a large fortune, and was one of the greatest landowners in the history of the state.

Lenoir's experience as a soldier began with two expeditions to Wilmington in 1776 on which, however, he saw no active service. That came as a lieutenant in the Surry company commanded by Captain Benjamin Cleveland⁸ on the expedition against the Cherokee in 1776, with

⁸ Benjamin Cleveland, born on May 26, 1738, in Prince William County, Virginia, grew to manhood in Orange County, where he married Mary Graves. In 1769 he became a resident of North Carolina, settling eventually on the Yadkin River. His first military experience was on the unsuccessful expedition to Kentucky in 1772. He was commissioned ensign in the Second Regiment of the North Carolina Line in 1775, lieutenant in January, 1776, and captain in November. In the meantime, Cleveland acted as captain of a company on the Cherokee expedition. Most of his early service was against the Indians. In 1778 he became colonel of the Wilkes County militia. He took part in the battles of Ramseur's Mill and King's Mountain. He served as chairman of the Wilkes County court, was a member of the House of Commons in 1778 and of the Senate in 1779 and 1780. His latter years were spent in South Carolina where he died in October, 1806. A sketch of him by Marshall deL. Haywood is available in *ibid.*, V, 69-73.

which the diary deals. Later he was active against the Tories in the western part of the state. He served as a captain in Cleveland's regiment at King's Mountain where he was twice wounded. Strong and hardy, he was a tireless soldier and when peace came he did not relax, retaining his strength and vigor, both of mind and body, up to the end of his life. At the age of eighty-seven, so family tradition has it, he regularly attended the county court at Wilkesboro, twenty-five miles away, and once rode on horseback across the mountains fifty miles to attend Ashe County court. He died May 6, 1839.

In the spring of 1776 the Cherokee Indians, inhabiting a large area in Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, inspired by the efforts of John Stuart and Alexander Cameron, the British Indian agents, began a series of attacks upon the white settlers of the frontier. News of this went quickly to the several state governments,* and about the same time the additional information came that the Cherokee had reached an agreement with the British agents to attack all along the frontier as soon as Sir Peter Parker and his fleet reached the coast. The attack on South Carolina followed upon the news of the fleet's arrival at Charleston, but its repulse there stopped the projected movement. To prevent any further renewal of the plan, the state governments planned military expeditions from Virginia, North Carolina, and South Carolina, to move simultaneously and to act in co-operation.

The North Carolina force of 2,800 men was placed under the com-

* General Griffith Rutherford to the Council of Safety, July 14, 1776, in William L. Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *The Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, 30 vols. (Raleigh, etc., 1886-1914), X, 669

"I am under the Nessety of sending you by Express, the Alleming Condition, this Contry is in, the Indins is making Grate prograce, in distroying & Murdering, in the frunteers of this County, 37 I am Informed was killed Last Wedensday and Thursday, on the Cuttaba River, I am also informed that Col^d McDowel 10 men more & 120 women and Children is Beshaged, in sume kind of a fort, & the Indins Round them, no help to them before yesterday, & they were surrounded on Wedensday. I Expect the Nex account to here, that they are all Distroyed. Col^d Backmans is the frunter of this County, pray Gentelmen Consider oure Distress, send us Plenty of Powder & I Hope unde God, we of Salisbery District is able to stand them, but, if you allow us to Go to the Nation, I Expect, you Will order Hilisbourgh District, to Joyn Salisbery, three off oure Captans is kiled & one Wounded. This Day I set out with what men I Can Raise for the Relefe of the Distrest."

mand of General Griffith Rutherford;⁵ that of Virginia, consisting of 1,500 men, who were to be reinforced by 300 North Carolinians, was commanded by Colonel William Christian;⁶ and that of South Carolina, 1,150 men, by Colonel Andrew Williamson.⁷ In addition, Georgia, as the event proved, was not idle, but sent a force under Colonel Sam-

⁵ Rutherford, born in Ireland about 1731, came to America in 1739, and to Rowan County, North Carolina, about 1753. "Uncultivated in mind or manners, but brave, ardent and patriotic," he became prominent in his community which he served ably for many years. He was in the colonial Assembly from 1766 to 1775; the provincial Congresses of April, 1775, and April and November, 1776; the state Senate from 1777 to 1780 and from 1783 to 1786; and was a member of the Council of State in 1782, 1789, 1790, and 1791; and sheriff in 1769. He became captain of militia in 1770, colonel in 1775, and brigadier general in 1776. Rutherford was also a member of the Committee of Safety for the Salisbury district. In 1779 he took part in the relief expedition to Savannah. Commanding a brigade at Camden, he was wounded, captured, and imprisoned at St. Augustine until 1781 when he was exchanged and at once moved against the Loyalists in the eastern part of the state. After the Revolution he was a delegate to the Hillsboro convention of 1788 which refused to ratify the Constitution of the United States. Later he moved to Sumner County, Tennessee, and in 1794 became president of the Legislative Council. He died in 1800. Both North Carolina and Tennessee named counties for him. A sketch of him by Samuel A. Ashe appears in *Biographical History of North Carolina*, II, 381-85.

⁶ William Christian was born at Staunton, Virginia, about 1743. At twenty he became a captain of militia. He studied law under Patrick Henry and married his sister. He lived in Botetourt and later in Fincastle County, and represented the latter in the Assembly from 1773 to 1775, and both in the Senate in 1776 and 1780-1783. He was a member of the Committee of Safety in 1775 and of the provincial Congresses of March and July of that year. A colonel of militia in Dunmore's war, he became lieutenant colonel of the First Virginia Regiment, Continental Line, in February, 1776, colonel in March, and resigned in July to become colonel in the militia and take command of the expedition against the Overhill Cherokee. In 1785 he moved to Kentucky and was killed April 9, 1786, while leading a party against Wabash Indian raiders. See Thomas D. McCormick, "William Christian," in *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), IV, 96.

⁷ Andrew Williamson, born in Scotland about 1730, was a planter in the Savannah River Valley not far from Ninety Six in 1760, when he served as a lieutenant in the South Carolina expedition against the Cherokee. He became major of militia in 1775 and took part in the engagements of that year with the Loyalists. He became colonel in 1776 and was placed in command of the South Carolina troops in the Cherokee campaign. Later he had some part in negotiating the treaty with the Indians. Williamson became a brigadier general in 1778 and commanded the South Carolina troops in the ill-fated Howe expedition to Florida. Accused, with apparently good cause, of treason in 1780, he won the title "Arnold of Carolina" and narrowly escaped hanging. The fact that, while aiding the British, he also aided the Americans, seems to have saved him. He died near Charleston in 1786. See Anne K. Gregorie, "Andrew Williamson," *ibid.*, XX, 296-97.

uel Jack,⁸ which entered and destroyed all the Indian towns on the Tugaloo River.

The Cherokee towns, the object of attack, lay chiefly in three well-defined groups: the Lower Towns with 356 gun men; the Middle and Valley Towns with 878 men; and the Overhill Towns with 757 men. Outlying towns had about 500 warriors more, making a total of about 2,000 fighting men to be subdued.⁹

According to the plan of campaign, the South Carolina troops were to attack the Lower Towns and then join Rutherford, on September 9, near Cowee on the Little Tennessee River, for the attack on the Middle and Valley Towns. The Virginia troops were to attack the Overhill Cherokee in the Holston Valley and, if possible, the rest of the forces would join them there. Colonel Williamson moved promptly, destroyed the Lower Towns near the head of the Savannah River in the neighborhood of Walhalla, and at Essenecca defeated a combined force of Scovellite Tories and Indians under Cameron, and destroyed their stores. From thence they moved on through Rabun Gap to join Rutherford.

Meanwhile, Rutherford had been busy preparing for the expedition, and for the protection of the frontier. Leaving Salisbury, he passed up the Island Ford Road, a few miles south of Morganton, and moved on to Old Fort where he received reinforcements. The regiment from Surry, commanded by Colonel Martin Armstrong,¹⁰ arrived shortly. In it was William Lenoir. A regiment from Burke County under Colonel Joseph McDowell also joined him. Another from Orange County arrived, but, since the force already assembled seemed adequate, was sent

⁸ Samuel Jack became a colonel on the general staff of the Georgia Brigade, Continental Line. He died in Wilkes County, Georgia, at the age of sixty-five.

⁹ Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, X, 882. Cf. J. G. M. Ramsey, *Annals of Tennessee* (Kingsport, Tenn., 1853), 162-64.

¹⁰ Martin Armstrong was an early settler of Surry County. He served in the provincial Congress of August, 1775, and was at the time elected colonel of militia, a rank that he held throughout the Revolution. Active in warfare with the Loyalists, he served with distinction at King's Mountain. Armstrong became a justice of the peace in 1778 and continued to serve for many years. He was a member of the state Senate in 1783 and of the House of Commons in 1789, and was active in county affairs thereafter. In later years he was suspected of some connection with the western land frauds.

back home. Before leaving for the campaign, Rutherford, with a picked force, crossed the mountains rapidly and dispersed five hundred Indian foragers on the Nolichucky.

Rutherford was an experienced Indian fighter and his force was made up of eager volunteers, well armed and equipped.¹¹ His instructions were simple and gave him full rein. He was to move into the Indian country "and there act in such a manner as to you in your good sense & judgement may seem best so as effectually to put a stop to the future depredations of those merciless Savages."¹²

Leaving Old Fort on September 1, he crossed the Black Mountains at Swannanoa Gap, followed the river to the French Broad, which he crossed at Warrior Ford below Asheville. Then, passing up Hominy Creek and across the ridge to Pigeon River and Richland Creek, he crossed Balsam Mountain, the dividing ridge between the present Haywood and Jackson counties, to the head of Scott's Creek, which he followed to the Tuckaseegee River. He crossed at an Indian town called Storock, a mile from the present Whittier's Station, and then proceeded towards Cowee. A force of a thousand men was detached and sent forward to surprise the Middle Towns, but they encountered and defeated a small band of Indians and thus revealed the presence of the expedition. Consequently when they reached the towns, they found them evacuated. Destroying them all and laying waste the fields, Rutherford then hastened to effect the junction with Williamson at Cowee, but, when the latter, who had been delayed, did not arrive, he pushed on toward the Valley Towns without waiting. Lacking any guide he missed the usual trail for crossing the Nantahala Mountains and thus escaped an attack from ambush by five hundred braves who lay for several days in Waya Gap, waiting for his coming. Two days

¹¹ The North Carolina Council of Safety wrote General Charles Lee, July 16, 1776: "The Troops Brigadier Rutherford carries with him are as chosen Rifle Men as any on this Continent and are hearty and determined in the present cause. We have every expectation from them. With pleasure we assure you that they are well armed & have plenty of Ammunition in short they are well equipped." Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, XI, 316-17.

¹² *Ibid.*, 318-19.

later they attacked Williamson's force, killing twelve and wounding twenty of his men before being forced to retreat.

In the meantime, Rutherford had pushed on to Valley River, in the present Cherokee County, and down that stream to the Hiwassee River near the present town of Murphy, destroying all the Indian towns and devastating their fields.

In the campaign some thirty-six towns were completely destroyed and with them every variety of stores and crops. There was little fighting and Rutherford lost only three men in battle. The Indians' loss of men was not much greater, but they were left with the prospect of starvation before them and with their power broken.

On September 26 Williamson and his force finally arrived. Orders were received to assist Colonel Christian against the Overhill Towns, and to cut a road through the mountains for future use. A conference of officers decided that passage across the Smoky Mountains would be impossible if opposed, and agreed to return home. Rutherford's force went back by the way it had come and gave to the trails followed the name of "Rutherford's Trace."¹⁸

WILLIAM LENOIR'S JOURNAL OF THE CHEROKEE EXPEDITION

A. D. 1776

JOURNAL OF WM. LENOIR, AUGT. 1776

After Ranging sometime on the head of Reddeys River with 25 men Capt. Jos. Herndon¹⁴ was Ordered to Raise as many men as would be Equal to the number of Guns in his Destrict and Perade at the General place of Randezvous at Cub Creek 13 Instant we Peraded Accordingly, wednesday the 14th I took 30 men out of our Company and as Lieutenant of the same joined Capt. Ben Cleveland with 20 of his men—& Elected Saml. Simpson¹⁵ Ensign &C.

¹⁸ The most elaborate account of Rutherford's campaign is that by Samuel A. Ashe, in *North Carolina Booklet*, 23 vols. (Raleigh, 1901-1926), IV, No. 5.

¹⁴ Joseph Herndon, born near Fredericksburg, Virginia, about 1751, settled in Surry County, North Carolina, at a date unknown, served as a captain during the Revolution, and fought at King's Mountain. He was a noted gunsmith and also a surveyor. Herndon was a member of the county court of Wilkes, served in the House of Commons in 1781, 1782, 1783, 1788, and 1793, and in the convention of 1789 which ratified the Constitution of the United States. He died in 1798.

¹⁵ Here and in all later cases of proper names without annotation no information concerning the person is obtainable.

On Saturday 17th Instant August marched from the Mulberry field meeting house to Moravian Creek 6 miles. On Monday 18th marched to Beaver Cre. 10. On Tuesday 19th marched 4 miles Coxes— 4. On Wednesday 20th marched to Cryders fort,¹⁶ 12. On Tue. 21st marched to another fork of Mulberry Creek 2 miles— 2 (& there stayd till Monday)

On Monday 26 Augt. march to St. John's River near the Quaker meaders on the Catawper River— 14

On Tuesday 27th xd [crossed] at the Quaker Mead. & march'd about 5 miles above Muddy Cr. 14

On Wed.y 28 lost 7 steers marched in amongst the other troops to Buck Creek— 10

On Fridy 30 marched by the head quarters to one fork of the Catawper where we Descovered much Damage done By the Indians & pritty plenty of old sign (Wm. Sharp¹⁷ Esq. in camp)

Continued Saterdag 31

On Sunday 1st Sepr. marched with the Brigade over the Ridge to Creek of Swanano (Pack horses came up) 10 word of Peroled Genl. Washington

On Monday 2 marched with the Surry Detachmt. in the front—whole Bregard 2 (containing about 3500 men) Down Swanano xx— 11

N. B. Jonathan Huff was accidently killed by one of his own Company under Command of Capt. Falls¹⁸ of Rowan County. Capt. Cleavd. & Capt. Henderson¹⁹ Quarreled.

On Tues.y 3rd Sepr. marcht next to the front xd French Broad River and Camp on Rutherfords Creek. 9

On Wed.y 4 marcht in the front over the mountains to a Branch of Pigion River— 10

On Thu.y 5th marcht in the Rear Rowan in the front to another Branch of sd. River Richland Creek— 11

On Friday 6th marcht in a very Rough way & William Alexander²⁰ of Meck-

¹⁶ Probably ford is intended. There is no record of such a fort.

¹⁷ William Sharpe, then a member of the Council of Safety from the Salisbury district, accompanied the expedition as an aide to Rutherford. Saunders *et al.* (eds.), *Colonial [and State] Records of North Carolina*, X, 860. Born in Cecil County, Maryland, December 13, 1742, Sharpe came in 1763 to Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, and became a lawyer. He removed to Rowan (now Iredell) County, which he represented in the provincial Congresses of April and August, 1775, and that of November, 1776, which adopted the state constitution. In 1777 he was a member of the commission to negotiate a treaty with the Cherokee. Sharpe served in the Congress of the Confederation from 1779 to 1782. He died in July, 1818. A brief sketch of him appears in Cyrus L. Hunter, *Sketches of Western North Carolina* (Raleigh, 1877), 189-90.

¹⁸ Gilreath Falls, who was later killed at Ramseur's Mill.

¹⁹ Probably Michael Henderson of Salisbury district, later a captain in the Ninth Regiment, North Carolina Continental Line.

²⁰ William Alexander, commonly known as "Captain Black Bill," was born presumably

lenburg saw 5 Indians and run from them after Reinforcement pursued them and found 1 gun— we marcht on to a Branch of Tuckeysegy River— 9

On Saturday 7th Divided the Bregade and Col. Francis Lock²¹ took 1000 privates & some Light-horse & started 11½ before day & marcht to a little-Town on Tuckeyseagey River 8 miles from thence towards watauger saw some indians walking up a mountain & we was attacted by about 20 indians on the top of the mountain at 3 o'clock within about 7 miles of s.d Town. William Alexander was wounded in the foot and no visible Dammage done to the Indians only a few kettles taken &c. then marcht within 2 miles of the s.d Town and lay on a small Emenance 20

On Sunday 8th marcht into said Town without any opposition finding no indians at any of the Towns; Detacht 200 men back to bring up the Rear— 2

On Monday 9th The General arived at s.d Watauger Town—

On Tuesday 10 Despacht 600 men to meet the South Carolina fources commanded by [writer's blank] Williamson & the Remainder to Reconitree the Towns and plantations and Destroy the Corn Houses &c.— the afs.d men went up Tennecy River to Nukercy [Nequassee ?] Town & Echocy and found much Corn &c. being about 7 miles.

On Wedy 11th we all merched to Cowee Town a scouting party saw 2 Indians—

On Thury. 12th Despached a party of men to Allejoy about 7 miles down Tennecy who saw some Indians killed & sculpt 1 Indian Squaw was Fired at by a few Indians who killed Nichl. Peck of Rowan County 2nd Batalion

On Friday 13th The s.d men Returned to Cowees- Town again

On Saturday 14th we Removed Up to nucercy [Nequassee ?] 2 miles above Watauga. Capt. Erven Sr. of Mecklenburg Died—

On Sunday 15 held a Councel of war by which was ordered the 1200 Rank & file Exclusive of all the light horse be Despacht— on Monday 16 for the Destroying the Valley Towns & among which were 98 out of Surry Regt. 42 out of Our Compy whom I am to head as Capt. till we return—

On Monday 16 We started to the Valley Towns M. Walton and I quarreled marched 6 miles and took up Camp 6

On Tuesday 17 as we marched 3 Indians fired on a man who had turned back a small Distance never tuched him, marchd 8 miles to Nowe [Noyowee ?] Town which had about 70 houses in it then up the Creek 1 mile and campd without fire. [scratched out— "men fit to Muternize"] 9

in Mecklenburg in 1749. He was an able and active soldier throughout the Revolution. He died on December 19, 1836.

²¹ Francis Locke of Rowan, a brother of the better known Matthew Locke, became colonel of the First Rowan Regiment in 1776, and was an effective officer throughout the Revolution but won particular distinction at the battle of Ramseur's Mill.

Linkister

On Wedy. 18th march.d over 2 very steep mountains and Camp't on the head of a Creek of hywassey the lighthorse took 50 or 60 lb of Powder & 12 Horses and some other Articles Major Pickins²² Brought Tidings from y's'a — 12

On Thur 19 we march't into one of the Valley Towns killed 6 Indians & took 3 Prisoners some horses &c. & camp't at a Quannasy [Quanassee ?] Town on hywassey— 12

On Friday 20th killed 2 Indians & took 31 [or 3] prisoners and Destroyed a Deal of Corn &c.

On Saturday 21st we Despach.d about 200 men to [writer's blank] & march'd from Quonnecy [Quanassee] by Chowa 2 miles & past it & incamp't— 5

On Sunday 22nd as we march'd John Roberson killed an old Indian prisoner & was put under Guard Tyed for it and march'd into Aconolof'ta,²³ a number of Indians fired on 2 of our men killed Joshua Turner of 1st Batalion of Rowan a Young married man & wounded John Howard who says he killed 1 Indian and had several guns shot at him as he Crossed a Creek— 7

On Monday 23 Despach'd all the light horse to assist the afsd. Detachment

On Tuesday 24 sent off 25 men to the South Army & the other afsd. Detachment Brought in Mr. Walter Scot Mr. Hicks their squaws and children 4 negroes and some other prisoners 12 in all with about 70 or 80 head of horses & a number of cattle 25 horse loads of skins & Sundry other things—

On Wednesday 25th sold off the afsd. articles at a very Dear Rate small silver Broaches at 13' &c.—White Frost—

²² Andrew Pickens, born near Paxtany, Pennsylvania, September 19, 1739, came as a child with his family which drifted south, stopping for a time at Staunton, Virginia, and in Anson County, North Carolina. In 1752 they were on Waxhaw Creek in South Carolina. Pickens served in the Cherokee campaign of 1760-1761. In 1763 he moved to Long Cane Creek, and about this time he married Rebecca Calhoun, a first cousin of John C. Calhoun. He fought at Ninety Six in 1775 as a captain of militia, and became a colonel when Williamson was promoted brigadier general. He defeated a force of Loyalists at Kettle Creek but in 1780 submitted to the British. Released on parole, he again took the field after his plantation was ravaged by the British. Congress gave him a sword for his part at Camden, and South Carolina made him a brigadier general. Pickens took part in the capture of Augusta and fought at Ninety Six and at Eutaw Springs where he was wounded. He was in the legislature in 1782 and in Congress from 1793 to 1795. In 1795 he became major general of militia, and from then until 1801 was constantly engaged in negotiations with the Indians. He conducted a store on his plantation and later engaged in business in Charleston and in Pendleton. He died on August 11, 1817. Andrew L. Pickens, *The Wizard Owl of the Southern Highlands* (n. p., 1933). A sketch of him, by Anne K. Gregorie, appears in the *Dictionary of American Biography*, XIV, 558-59.

²³ Okona Luf'ty.

On Thursday 26 moved Down to [writer's blank] and all the light horse Attended General Rutherford to meet General Wmson who Joind our Bregade and saluted with 13 Swivel Guns.

On Friday 27 started towards the middle Towns marched x to River and up sd. River 6 miles being the most beautiful Vally I 'de seen and took up Camp and 1 man of Mecklenburg Dyed—13

On Saturday 28 march'd a very Rough way x middle River &c— 11

On Sunday 29th we marchd by whare the South army fought the Battle saw the Dead Indians lying & where the buried their dedd in a Branch & made a Cosey over them & by a small town and Naukersy [Nequassee ?] and Join'd our Bregade where 2 men had Dyed in our absence— 15

P.S. One of the Giltford men, Saml. Curry, was left behind sick, was killed and sculp.

On munday 30th we all marchd over Tuckeysegey River and Camp't. Some horses stole from the Rowans 12

On Tuesday. 1st October surry Tryon & Anson Countys had leave to march on; Mecklenburg started of before it was light, surry started early and gave them a smart Chase and Camp't on Pigion River— 25

On Wedy. 2nd one of the Mecklenburg's on Pigion River near our Encampments got shot through the Grynes [crossed out—"supposing it to be done on purpose and who shot and ran off & Escaped; we"] heard 4 men of the sick [crossed out—"and wounded"] with the General 5 miles behind us died sd. night; sot in to Raining in the morning, tho moderately being almost the first Rain that Interferred with our marching, left Toddy beyond the moun.n on other side Rutherford Creek crossed Rutherford Creek & French Broad River —20— sot in to raining & we took up Camp.

On Thury. 3rd After a smart nights Rain we prepared to march X Swanneno River 3 times and Encamp't. near the Ridge; had a very Rainey night.

On Friday 4th we xd the Ridge though very slippery & the horses would slip sometimes 20 or 30 feet but all got over & Camp't. just below Cathey's fort & Colo. Armstrong treated with 6 gals. Brandy.

On Saty. 5 Capt. Cleavland & Capt. Ferree²⁴ had a very smart quarrel. Capt. Cleavland & I Treated the men with 2 gallons Brandy & at Cryder's fort he Treated with 7 or 8 Galns. Cyder.

[MS. torn here, two words illegible] Qrs. & I got home Monday nt. 7 Oct. 1776

WILLIAM LENOIR,

²⁴ Jacob Ferree of Surry County.

1776 May 31th on an Expedition against the Indns the followg:

Persons listed Viz—²⁵

Chas. Hill	Benja. Johnson g ²⁸	John Gouge
John Hall	Saml. Johnson ²⁹	Wm. Spicer g
Timothy Holdaway	Wm. Jones	Ephriam Parmely
Jas. Wall	Hilley Russel	John Morgan ³⁰
Thos. Carver	Charles Adams	John Tyrah
Wm. Gilreath ²⁶	Nat Gordon	George Read
Jas. Fletcher ²⁷	*Jos. Copeland	Segnard Miller
Chas. Bond g Junr.	Nat Judd	John Morriss g
Jos. Tanner g—	*John Sheppard	Wm. Johnson
Moses Parks	Thos. Turner	Jos. Gartwright

July 13, 1776 Recd. for Publick serv.

1 Rifle gun of Jas. Wall Praisd. to £ 5-10-0

1 smooth Gun of Jacob Wall prd. 1-10-0

Soldiers,

Jas. Burk	Thos. Turner
Wm. Gilreath	Jo. Porter
Saml. Simpson	*Wm. Ray
Thos. Carver —)	*Jas. Wall
h found	*Andrew Bolling & horse
Timothy Holdaway)	*Benj. Elsburry & horse
Hilley Russel	Ben Angel
Thos. Sparks	John Yeats
*Nathl. Gordon	Zack.h Bond
Henry Adams	*Oliver Grisham
Jo. Tanner	Chas. Johnson
John Burk	Whit. Wilson ³¹
*Chas. Hickerson	Andrew Yannay
*John Grain	John Morgan

²⁵ Names marked with an asterisk were crossed out with a pen.

²⁶ The name appears on the list of Revolutionary pensioners as a private who rose to be captain.

²⁷ James Fletcher represented Wilkes County in the Hillsboro convention of 1788.

²⁸ A Benjamin Johnson became a corporal of the Second North Carolina Regiment, December 26, 1776, and served until January 30, 1780.

²⁹ The name appears on the list of Revolutionary pensioners as a private who rose to captain.

³⁰ Four North Carolina Revolutionary captains bore this name.

³¹ Whitfield Wilson of Halifax County was commissioned quartermaster of the Third Regiment, North Carolina Continental Line, on April 24, 1777.

June 18th: 1776, Recd. of Capt. Wm. Shepperd³² £ 56" 5" 8 in full for the first Expn to Wilmington only Victualing Excepted & Draw'd the Officers Wages as followeth:

Capt. Jos. Herndon 12 days @ 10/ £ 6-1-0
 Lieut Wm. Lenoir 13 days @ 7/6 — 4-17-6
 Cornet John Baker³³ 10 days @ 6/8 — 3-6-8
 and all the rest 4/6 per day Each—
 sd. Shepperd Victualed our Company 4 days
 The Number of Rations he found was 88
 & we all the rest amounting to ——— 134

in all for sd. Expn. ————— 222
 which I gave Col. Arnstron a Rect. for

N. B. he took the sd. Rect. in Wm. Shepperds name & I gave it in Jos. Herndon name in order for him in the name of Commy. to Draw our pay for the same 1 for foriage also which we found all only at the Moravin Town 1 Evening and morning—

Also I gave Col. Armstrong Rects. in like manner for the following Rations which we found altogether to wit:

on the 2nd Expd. to Wilmington, 206 Rations
 Ditto Foriage for horses, 206 Do.

On the Expn. to New River on foot 215 Rations
 which Col. Armstrong hath promised to pay if he can get the Acct. allowd.

P. S. 140 Rations we found Hardgrave)
 and 140 Rations foriage for sd. horses) Wm. Lenoir

³² William Sheppard, born in 1747, was an early settler of Surry County, who commanded a troop of cavalry on the Cherokee expedition. He served for a time as first lieutenant in the Tenth North Carolina Regiment, and in 1778 was elected army contractor for the Salisbury district. He represented Surry in the state Senate from 1778 to 1781. Later he moved to Orange and was again a senator in 1801 and 1803. He died on February 8, 1822.

³³ Baker was commissioned lieutenant in November, 1776, captain in July, 1777, and major in January, 1778.

Book Reviews

The British Empire before the American Revolution. Volume IV, Zones of International Friction: North America, South of the Great Lakes Region, 1748-1754. By Lawrence Henry Gipson. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1939. Pp. xlii, 312, xlv. Maps. \$5.00.)

In previous volumes (reviewed in the November, 1936, issue of the *Journal*) Professor Gipson described the civilization of the Empire and the machinery of imperial and provincial administration. In this volume he discusses in all its frontier ramifications the role of the dynamic forces of private enterprise and initiative in extending the boundaries of the Empire, in controlling the Indian trade, and in precipitating the titanic struggle between England and France for colonial domination in North America. The chief motive for expansion was the lure of profits for British and colonial manufacturers, traders, shipowners, planters, and settlers, and not in the least the profits which the Indian hoped to secure from traffic with Europeans.

The central facts in this drama are two: the Indian's need for manufactured goods, especially implements of war, and the superior power of the English trader to offer goods to the Indian on a more favorable exchange ratio than the French. This, French provincial officials continually reminded their superiors at Versailles, was the secret of the English influence over the Indians. On the eve of war French policy envisaged the expulsion of the English by military occupation of Trans-Appalachia, and the conciliation of the Indians by selling goods on terms more advantageous than the English. However, the plan failed, as the author takes pains to point out, for three fundamental reasons: scarcity of food supplies resulting from exclusion of non-Catholics who could have built a prosperous American empire for France; the blighting effects of a corrupt and authoritarian administrative organization; and the inability to secure and sell goods at low cost. Professor Gipson is quite frank in his disapproval of French policy and in his approbation of English colonial policy.

Concurrently, the Indians realized that it was desirable to trade on the basis, not of loyalty to one power, but of advantageous prices, and that all white men were their enemies, instigating them to intertribal warfare in order to destroy them and leave the country vacant for Europeans.

On the domestic side Professor Gipson demonstrates that the precarious structure of Indian-trader debt relationships, and the class divisions between planters

and yeomanry were certain to precipitate a crisis in imperial affairs. Furthermore, there was a growing realization, voiced by Governor James Glenn of South Carolina, the Ohio Company officials, and the Pennsylvania authorities that a common intercolonial front was necessary in Indian affairs. Truly the stage was set for war and social upheaval.

The mastery of sources, wealth of detail, and clarity of exposition which distinguished the preceding volumes are found in this book. The inclusion of numerous contemporary maps adds to the usefulness of the volume.

Museum of Science and Industry, Chicago

CHARLES F. STRONG

Our Catholic Heritage in Texas, 1519-1936. Prepared under the Auspices of the Knights of Columbus of Texas Historical Commission, Paul J. Foik, C. S. C., editor. Volume IV, *The Mission Era: The Passing of the Missions, 1762-1782*, by Carlos E. Castañeda. (Austin: The Von Boeckmann-Jones Company, 1939. Pp. xiv, 409. Bibliography, illustrations, maps. \$5.00.)

The volume under review gives a detailed picture of mission life and organization in Texas during the latter part of the eighteenth century, in the years following France's cession of western Louisiana to Spain at the close of the Seven Years' War. There was some fear of foreign aggression at this time, especially English, but the author is not so much concerned with matters outside of the province as with the internal development of Texas. Chapter I, in fact, is devoted to a census of the missions—describing the mission buildings, their number, size, condition, and the furnishing of the individual buildings and rooms, all to the last detail. We see the whole mission establishments, the granary, the herds of cattle, sheep, and goats; we see the friars and their flocks and the numbers at each of the missions. While this information is not wholly new, it is presented in greater detail than heretofore.

Chief developments in this score of years were the founding, on the Trinity River, of the presidio of San Agustín de Ahumada, 1756, Mission Nuestra Señora de la Luz del Orcoquisac, and the failure of plans for establishing a civil settlement there, after much controversy, ending in the abandonment of these posts in 1771. Meantime, Colonel Parrilla undertook a campaign against the northern tribes, as a sequel to the San Sabá massacre, a project that ended with disaster and foreshadowed troublous times for the Spanish establishments in Texas, for the hostile tribes were obtaining weapons from foreign aggressors who were sweeping them onward in their own irresistible westward advance.

The author devotes a chapter to the return of Captain Rábago y Terán to San Sabá, 1760, the rebuilding of Presidio San Luis de las Amarillas, and the founding of two missions, San Lorenzo del Cañon and Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria. But there were continual threats from the hostile Indians, leading the authorities to order a general inspection of the frontier; to the Marqués de Rubí was entrusted this commission. Accompanied by the engineer, Nicolás de la

Century," by Michael Kraus, traces the effects on Irish opinion and the Irish radical movement of the American Revolution. Irish leaders read American newspapers and pamphlets, copied American demonstrations, and adopted American arguments.

The press work on the book is excellent, and in its entirety the volume is a credit to all who contributed to it.

Agnes Scott College

PHILIP DAVIDSON

A Gazetteer of the State of Georgia. By Rev. Adiel Sherwood. Biographical sketch by John B. Clark. Foreword by Spright Dowell. (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1939. Pp. ix, 143. Frontispiece, appendix, map. \$2.00.)

Adiel Sherwood was twenty-seven years of age when he, seeking relief from impending tuberculosis, gave up his studies at Union Theological Seminary and migrated from his native state of New York to Georgia. In 1820, two years after his arrival at Savannah, he was ordained a Baptist minister. For the next forty-five years he served his denomination as pioneer preacher, Sunday School organizer, college president, and author of religious tracts. In addition to these activities he found time to compile four editions of his *Gazetteer*: 1827, 1829, 1837, and 1860. The present volume is a facsimile reprint of the original 1827 edition, to which has been added a photograph of the author and a map of Georgia from the 1829 edition.

This small volume is divided into three parts: a brief general description of Georgia in 1827; an alphabetical arrangement of sentence descriptions of the counties, towns, and geographical points of interest; and an appendix containing considerable statistical information. On the whole it presents a concise, systematic, and fairly accurate array of material which may be of some value to the researcher, although its importance from this standpoint is somewhat diminished by the fact that Professor Amanda Johnson in her *Georgia as Colony and State* had already utilized most of the information in this and the companion volumes before this reprint appeared. As an interesting document in the development of the Baptist church in Georgia it will have considerable sentimental value, for next to Jesse Mercer there probably is no name higher in the annals of the Georgia Baptist Convention than that of Adiel Sherwood.

The author's collection of provincial expressions and "erroneous pronunciations," had it been of greater length, undoubtedly would have constituted a most valuable portion of the book. Unfortunately, however, only one page is devoted to this.

Armstrong Junior College

J. P. DYER

Marshall and Taney: Statesmen of the Law. By Ben W. Palmer. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1939. Pp. viii, 281. Illustrations. \$3.50.)

The author of this study is an attorney, and a lecturer on business law at the University of Minnesota. He has worked over the essentials in the lives of Marshall and Taney with great care. He has attempted with much success to present each with fairness and impartiality. To him, both Marshall and Taney were great justices, each making his own valuable contributions. He starts with the idea that Marshall has been "canonized" while Taney has been "cursed." He questions the justice of the verdicts which have been rendered, especially that relative to Taney, and his effort has been to present each man in a true light.

There is an introductory chapter, "Are Judges Human Beings?" and a concluding chapter, "The Durable Result." Five of the intervening chapters (about 100 pages) are devoted to Marshall, while three chapters (about 80 pages) are assigned to Taney. Mr. Palmer is in close harmony with Albert J. Beveridge, Marshall's great biographer, in regard to the training, characteristics, and place in history of the famous Chief Justice. He quotes with approval the claim of Beveridge that, when Marshall established the supremacy of written constitutions over legislative acts, he made "America's original contribution to the Science of law" (p. 83). Also, Mr. Palmer asserts: "Not forgotten, but immaterial today, are the criticisms of the opinion [*Marbury v. Madison*] that its important doctrine is not law but dictum" (p. 82). The reviewer is unable to agree that such criticisms have become "immaterial today." Able and significant criticisms have been voiced against the assumed power of the Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, are being voiced today, and will be voiced in the future. Indeed, it is highly probable that, if representative government continues to live in the United States, this power will not continue to be exercised. It seems strange, too, that so few eulogists of Marshall have ever noticed that, if he had not established the power of the Court to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, all acts of Congress that have been pronounced constitutional by the Court would have remained valid without such pronouncement.

Naturally, a writer on Taney must give much space to the decision in the *Dred Scott* case. Mr. Palmer is certainly not far wrong when he declares of Taney that "his whole life has been read in the light of that decision" (p. 145). Reviewing the opinions of the majority and minority justices and analyzing the condemnations of Taney, the author argues that the Chief Justice of 1857 was, and has continued to be, the victim of injustice. His effort to reappraise Taney and to set forth his side of the great controversy is praiseworthy, and his conclusions deserve careful consideration. He is certainly more nearly correct than have been any of the extreme critics of Taney.

When reviewing the work of Taney as a jurist in relation to the greater part of his work as chief justice, Mr. Palmer is convincing. He is especially strong

in his portrayal of Taney's position in *The Charles River Bridge v. Warren Bridge*, in which the Chief Justice took issue with the different principle laid down in the case of *Dartmouth College v. Woodward*. In connection with this and other cases, some utterances such as would be expected from the man who served in Jackson's cabinet and helped to break the power of the Bank of the United States are found. It is of much interest to know that Taney could say: "While the rights of private property are sacredly guarded we must not forget that the community also have rights, and that the happiness and well-being of every citizen depends on their faithful preservation" (p. 227).

The volume is somewhat marred by the discursive tendency of the author. There are many paragraphs that could be strengthened by more concise writing. It seems necessary to say also that, when the author has studied Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as carefully as he has studied John Marshall and Roger Brooke Taney, he will understand them better than he does at present. There seems to be but few slips in the book, but it may be noted that the name of Roscoe Conkling should not be spelled "Conklin" (p. 278), and that the case of *Dred Scott v. Sanford* did not originate in the "District Court" of the United States for Missouri (p. 192), but in the Circuit Court of the United States which included Missouri. The format of the volume is excellent.

Indiana University

WILLIAM O. LYNCH

John Tyler: Champion of the Old South. By Oliver Perry Chitwood. (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 496. Frontispiece, appendices. \$4.00.)

If one of John Tyler's contemporaries had planned to write an impartial biography of that much maligned president, he ought first to have considered the challenge which Kipling later phrased in the lines:

"If you can keep your head when all about you
Are losing theirs. . ."

Few men of Tyler's day kept their heads when thinking of President Tyler. Even today it is not easy to arrive at a judicious estimate of his career because even though his burning effigies are now scattered ashes, the historian is properly skeptical of the impartiality of documents that were written in their lurid glow. And if the contemporary documents are under suspicion, so also are some of the more recent studies: they have come in large measure from the pen of his devoted son, Dr. Lyon G. Tyler, who was obviously a staunch defender of his father.

In the opinion of the present reviewer, a major virtue of this 500-page life of Tyler is the care and common sense with which truth has been sought from sources that are often distorted and biased. Indeed, the process by which the historian works as well as the results he attains are both here published; a good

deal of the necessary but unlovely work of appraising sources and evaluating evidence is presented in the text. Much of this might have been relegated to footnotes or appendices with resultant savings in space and with fewer interruptions to the narrative. But this concern with controversial evidence and fine distinctions, as distracting as it would be in the lives of many men, seems fitting in the biography of a man who was himself so accustomed to controversy and so concerned with minute constitutional points. Perhaps the best proof of the wisdom of Professor Chitwood's procedure is the fact that he has been able to present the story of Tyler's life clearly and to adapt his style to the nature of his material. Nor has he hesitated to perform the useful service of stating his conclusions concerning the expediency or in expediency, the wisdom or foolishness of Tyler's actions. For instance, while believing him to have been distinguished for his courage, honesty, and adherence to fixed principles in a time when these traits, especially the last, were none too common among American statesmen, he nevertheless is convinced that Tyler "showed himself a victim of a dilettante doctrinairism that often marred his record as a statesman" (p. 138). Other conclusions that Professor Chitwood has reached are these: in the Virginia constitutional convention of 1829-1830 Tyler behaved as a politician rather than as a statesman; he never appeared to better advantage than in the part he played in the nullification crisis; his greatest mistake was his failure to return to the Democratic party after the election of 1836; and Clay is accorded chief blame for his break with Tyler.

Although this study demonstrates that there must be considerable revision, and this in Tyler's favor, in commonly accepted views, it does not prove, nor does Chitwood claim that it has proved, that Tyler was very wise or very able. Even though full allowance be made for the difficulties and obstacles to success that he faced during his administration, one is inclined to apply to much of his public life the sentence with which Chitwood summarizes his management of the bank question: "He had kept the faith, even though he had not fought a good fight" (p. 268). This is to say that his virtues were those of inaction rather than of action; he was greater in what he was than in what he did. Nevertheless, Tyler commands respect because he was thoroughly consistent in adherence to his Jeffersonian, strict constructionist, conservative principles; he was honest; and he was singularly free from meanness and malice even though he suffered much from the presence of these traits in his enemies. And certainly there was something of true greatness in a man who, when he was being burned in effigy all over the land, even in sight of his own windows, could yet express the noble sentiment that "the light reflected from burning effigies served to render the path of duty more plain" (p. 290).

Andrew Jackson and the Constitution. By Frances Norene Ahl. (Boston: Christopher Publishing House, 1939. Pp. 168. Illustrations, bibliography, appendix. \$2.00.)

Unless one has something new to say there seems to be little excuse for adding another volume to the long list of works on Jackson. *Andrew Jackson and the Constitution* does not meet this requirement. Beginning with Jackson's military career and continuing with a discussion of the spoils system, nullification, the Bank, and the removal of the Indians, Miss Ahl presents in condensed form a story which has already been told in detail. The plan seems to have been to stress Jackson's inconsistencies and show how his "dominant personality" and "iron will . . . largely determined how and when these great issues should arise and be settled" in spite of laws of Congress or the Constitution. In places this task is well done, but most readers will question the extreme conclusion that Jackson "had a wholesale contempt for law" (p. 22) and that the "net result of Jacksonism was that it undermined respect for law and order in every department" (p. 117). Among other statements which are open to question are that Clay was the "founder" of the "American System" (p. 57) and that during the first ten months of Jackson's term he "removed more men from office than all his predecessors had removed since the founding of the Republic" (p. 68).

It would seem that a volume of this nature should at least mention Jackson's advocacy of several proposed changes in the Constitution. Furthermore, in interpretative volumes long quotations from letters and speeches (pp. 35-40, 118-23) can hardly be justified. The author could have improved her book by a study of the unpublished materials. The bibliography does not include the important manuscript collections and even omits valuable secondary works.

At no place has Miss Ahl been uninteresting and those who wish a concise account of Jackson's career will find the reading of this volume both pleasant and profitable.

State Teachers College, Memphis

J. H. PARKS

The Writings of Sam Houston, 1813-1863. Volume II, *July 16, 1814-March 31, 1842.* Edited by Amelia W. Williams and Eugene C. Barker. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1939. Pp. xxxi, 539. \$3.25.)

The first volume of this work, which was reviewed in this journal a year ago (May, 1939), included Houston's writings up to the end of 1836, at which time he had just begun his service as the first constitutional president of the Republic of Texas. The major part of the material in Volume II belongs to the period from January 1, 1837, to March 31, 1842, and it may be said to fall into three broad phases. The first of these is the remainder of Houston's first administration as president of the Republic, ending in December, 1838.

The second is the period of the Lamar administration, during which Houston was one of the most severe critics of his successor, and, at the same time, an active candidate for the office of president. The last covers the first four months of his second presidential term, beginning in December, 1841.

Naturally, Houston's writings reflected his plans, his ambitions, and his prejudices, and, perhaps in a measure, these made their contributions toward the creation of the confusion which existed in the affairs of the struggling Republic throughout the period. Most of the material during his terms as president is of an official nature and is drawn largely from the printed journals of the Texas Congress and from manuscript collections in the archives. It is particularly useful as a means of obtaining a view of affairs in Texas through the eyes of its highest official, although the fact must be recognized that there were undoubtedly other points of view to be taken into consideration. It hardly needs to be said, therefore, that any attempt to reconstruct the history of the Republic of Texas on the basis of this material alone would result in a decidedly biased version. One is still faced with the necessity of examining the extensive manuscript collections, both official and personal, from which this material has been drawn.

As for Houston himself, these writings are definitely revealing. They show his ability to discuss broad principles as well as to handle infinitesimal details. On the same date, for example, one finds him directing a minor officer in the army concerning the details of the equipment to be used in a scouting expedition and penning a veto message to Congress outlining the broad principles of a democratic government as he thinks they should be applied in Texas. With equal facility, apparently, he discusses the fundamentals of a land policy, the intricacies of financial problems, and the basis for relations with Indian tribes; and he seldom hesitated to tell anybody how to do anything. Equally significant is the difference between the emphasis of his writings as president and as ex-president. In the one case he is trying to explain and to justify his own policies. In the other case he is perhaps too obviously trying to discredit the man who succeeded him in office. As a result he condemns in no uncertain terms the critics of his own administration, while his criticism of Lamar's administration frequently descends to the level of personal vituperation. It is unfortunate, however, that the editors have not been able to find more of his private letters, because these should prove invaluable as a means of comparing what he wrote for public consumption with what he was saying privately to his close friends.

On the whole the editorial notes in this volume represent an improvement over those in Volume I. The information concerning the sources from which the documents are taken is more complete, and the biographical notes on individuals mentioned continue to provide a wealth of information concerning a large number of relatively obscure men. Until an adequate index is prepared, however, the task of locating any particular individual will be extremely difficult. For that reason, among others, the users of this material will continue to look

forward eagerly to the completion of the work. It should be added that the inclusion here of thirty-nine additional items belonging to the period covered by Volume I gives rise to a hope that other scattered material, as well as that in collections not now accessible, will become available before the publication of the final volume.

Vanderbilt University

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

Antislavery Origins of the Civil War in the United States. By DWIGHT LOWELL DUMOND. (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1939. Pp. viii, 143. Bibliography. \$2.00.)

This is a forthright book—as uncompromising in position and as dogmatic in statement as the abolitionists whom it seeks to explain and defend. And the author practically admits that it would be an additional virtue, if it were as emotional as the abolitionists, when he exclaims (p. 25), "Would that the historian might somehow recover the emotions which surge through men's hearts and alter civilizations!" There is some explanation and, perhaps, some justification for this sort of treatment in the fact that this book is the text of eight lectures which the author delivered under the Commonwealth Foundation at University College, London. Striking and challenging statements are easier to listen to.

No one can deny Professor Dumond authority to speak on antislavery origins in the United States or dismiss lightly his findings, for his editing the Weld-Grimké and the Birney letters has given him a deep knowledge of a part of his subject, if not all. Although indicating his acquaintance with the well-known fact that antislavery was not necessarily abolition, he deals almost entirely with the latter and might better have used that term in his title. He holds that the antislavery movement was "an intellectual and religious crusade for moral reform" (p. 1), and that the impulses back of the attack as well as of its defense were not economic. The defense "was of a social system and a system of racial adjustment, not of an economic institution" (p. 1). To contend that the South was not defending millions of dollars worth of its property as such, hardly makes good sense. Professor Dumond limits the origin and treatment of the movement to the Middle West, ignoring entirely New England and scarcely mentioning Garrison. Although this is in the direction of the most modern interpretation, can it be considered complete? Admitting that the Lane Seminary boys, in starting the movements in 1834, were crusaders to the point of fanaticism, does it necessarily follow that all the converts from that time down to 1860 were actuated by intellectual, religious, and moral considerations?

Not only does Professor Dumond get his enthusiasm from abolition writings but also most of his facts, holding that any pattern of Negro slavery "reconstructed from plantation life or from Southern documentary sources alone can be but fragmentary" (p. 4). With this attitude it should not be surprising, then, that he should make such flat statements as these: that the agricultural

South was "intellectually moribund" (p. 10); that it denied freedom of speech and the press "and drove everyone suspected of heresy out" (p. 39); that there was "no effective reply to" Weld's *American Slavery As It Is*, "nor could there have been" (p. 42); that slaveholders might "inflict any kind or degree of punishment without fear of redress" (p. 43); that Southerners came "eventually to have a distorted view of everything," but that the worst that could be said about abolitionists was that they were "likely to be obnoxious to those who differ with them" (p. 115). The Lane Seminary boys could hardly have done better than this, for, indeed, it is largely what they said.

More in the realm of that about which the facts may be variously interpreted, Professor Dumond has recorded other beliefs, striking and worthy of more consideration. He sees Lincoln in a different light from that in which Beveridge and other Lincoln scholars have placed him. Instead of his being conservative on the slavery question, Professor Dumond finds him quite radical, in fact an abolitionist *simon-pure*, whose election in 1860 was a menace to the institution of slavery. He also believes that Lincoln had determined on war as the only solution of the slavery question and that though he wanted to crush the rebellion and save the Union, his most impelling desire was to destroy slavery—thereby discounting what Lincoln himself said on the subject. Professor Dumond also does not believe that the mass of Americans were peaceable in 1860. At one point he states that the fear of the Federal government freeing the slaves was the "number one reason for secession" (p. 112), but at another point he makes the statement, which is equally as challenging, that without William L. Yancey's "brilliant oratory and indefatigable labors there would have been no secession, no Southern Confederacy" (p. 99). There are a few minor slips such as the adoption of the Thirteenth Amendment in 1867 instead of 1865 (p. 83), and confusing Joe Brown and Alexander H. Stephens in certain facts attributed to the latter (p. 105).

This book is an interesting example of abolition doctrines polished up with modern American scholarship, which, nevertheless, in many of its interpretations is bold and sometimes wise. It is too unfortunate that it had to be made so challenging to keep lecture audiences interested; for to that extent it misses being a sound historical work.

University of Georgia

E. MERTON COULTER

The Slavery Controversy, 1831-1860. By Arthur Young Lloyd. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1939. Pp. xi, 337. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

The subject of this monograph is the attack on slavery by the "new" abolitionists after 1830, and the southern pamphlet defense. Its central theme is the function of abolition propaganda in the sectional struggle to isolate the South from the agrarian West, so that it could be dominated by eastern industrialism.

After a brilliant and scholarly survey of the period before 1831, Dr. Lloyd describes the "new" abolitionist attack, the immediate reactions of southern writers, and their defense of slavery from the Bible and from economic and social necessities. Unfortunately the author's selection and interpretation of documents in the controversy are not always such as to establish confidence in his conclusions. Two examples will suffice.

The account of the "new" abolition attack upon slavery (pp. 70-101) which caused the South after 1836 to forbid abolition agitation within its borders is based almost entirely (126 of the 137 references to abolition literature within the designated pages) upon five works which, it can be stated categorically, were not among the documents which caused the southern reaction. George Bourne's *Slavery Illustrated in its Effects Upon Women* was not published until 1837, when "Father" Bourne had long been repudiated by abolitionists. *The Brotherhood of Thieves*, by Stephen S. Foster, a notorious crackpot of the "lunatic fringe" in Boston, was published in 1844, when battle lines had long been drawn. *The Anti-Slavery Bugle* was an obscure little "Garrisonian" weekly, published during the middle 1840's in southern Ohio. The other two works were British: Leed's *Anti-Slavery Tracts*, a collection of pamphlets, largely by British authors, published in London in 1853; and Harriet Martineau's comments on slavery, which are contained in her account of travel in America.

However inappropriate as illustrative of the "new" abolitionist attack, these documents are among the choicest examples of vituperation, obscenity, and slander which were printed on the subject of slavery in England or America. The author himself notes that many of these statements went unanswered by southern writers; but "while the slanderous charges of the abolitionists in this regard were silently ignored, they were not overlooked or forgotten, but instead caused the fires of undying hatred to smolder with intense heat in the hearts of Southern people."

In his discussion of the "Bible argument," the author's sympathies are even more dangerously engaged. Here in his judgment the defenders of slavery won a notable victory, and the despair of abolitionists "carried them to the point of denying the Bible which seemed to sanction slavery . . . and eventually carried the leaders off on tangents in the form of infidelism, anarchism, free-love, and communistic and Utopian schemes of government." What is more, the abolitionist defeat, in Dr. Lloyd's view, changed religious history: "It seems quite probable that the emphasis placed upon the Bible during the controversy led to a wave of infidelity and atheism in the North, and created a spirit of religious revival in the South."

In point of fact the abolitionists were also victorious in the "Bible argument" just as all sides were victorious in the Bible controversies regarding women's rights, temperance, and other social and doctrinal issues of the day. Methods of biblical interpretation were such that neither side could lose. Moreover, not

all of the tangents listed by the author denied the authority of the Bible. "Non-resistance," the anarchism of the 1830's, was a form of Christian pietism, and several of the communistic and Utopian schemes were conceived as "Bible commonwealths." Of the other tangents, free love had no champion among the leaders, and only LaRoy Sunderland became an "orthodox" infidel. Indeed, most of the leaders were men like Birney, Whittier, the Tappans, Weld, Orange Scott, Leavitt, Rankin, Giddings, and the rest,—embodiments of Christian piety. Finally, the wave of atheism in the North and the spirit of religious revival in the South which followed the Bible argument, are events which have escaped the attention of historians of religion in America.

It is unfortunate that the case for the southern point of view in the pamphlet controversy should thus be marred by bias in the selection and interpretation of material. The task is worth doing, and should be done.

Ohio Wesleyan University

GILBERT HOBBS BARNES

The Baltimore and Ohio in the Civil War. By Festus P. Summers. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1939. Pp. 304. Illustrations, bibliography, maps. \$3.00.)

The War between the States was the first armed conflict in which the railroad played a significant part. Whatever use the tacticians of that struggle chose to make of this new factor in mobility was precedent forming. The experiments they tried were dangerously weighted with victory or defeat for them, yet they were able in a few short years to develop considerable dexterity in the use of this almost entirely new instrument.

It seems strange that historians have so long ignored a subject as pregnant with possibilities as the use of railroads in war. It is fortunate, however, that after so many years of neglect the field should be opened by one as qualified by training and background as Professor Summers. This book sets a high standard in scholarship and readability for all who care to follow along the same avenue of research.

In the spring of 1861 no railroad in the country was as significant to the United States and the Confederacy as the Baltimore and Ohio. Its tracks gave the Federal capital its only direct connections with the Ohio River and the West. Yet more than half of this trackage lay within seceded Virginia. The implications of this state of affairs were tremendous.

How the United States succeeded in getting and keeping control of this artery—after portions of it had been seized by Confederates who were the first to foresee its importance—and how it became a prime factor in Lincoln's success in keeping the border states loyal to the Union are the central themes of this study. But there is more. In the first two chapters there is a concise and satisfactory account of the Baltimore and Ohio's history prior to the opening of

the war. The chapter, "Dilemmas in 1861," is a penetrating analysis of the problems facing the Federal government and the railroads when hostilities started. It is a synthesis of the conflicting forces which drove the railroad's president, John W. Garrett, now into a pro-Union policy, again into a pro-Confederate position.

Before completing the volume many readers may experience some confusion in following the numerous raids and counterraids by detachments in Blue and detachments in Gray. The larger picture may be obscured at times by the flying hoofs of cavalry horses. Still it is possible that when the reader has emerged from the dust, he will see that the whole canvas has taken on a richer color because this portion of it has been displayed in detail.

Those people who, on looking at a map of West Virginia, have questioningly wondered at its strange shape will here find an answer to their queries. They will also find how that strange shape was bound up in the very life of the Union.

Professor Summers writes with an attractive style. Well-chosen figures of speech, words fittingly selected, and an interesting variety of sentence forms make the narrative flow smoothly and pleasantly. He has included in his volume sixteen significant illustrations and eight well-drawn maps. These together with the evident scholarship that has gone into the work combine to reveal a new and instructive phase of the Civil War, and one of marked significance.

Ohio State University

HARVEY M. RICE

Statesmen of the Lost Cause: Jefferson Davis and His Cabinet. By Burton J. Hendrick. (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1939. Pp. xvii, 452. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.75.)

In this book Mr. Hendrick attempts to discover why the Confederacy failed. He has synthesized the laborious work of many scholars and has presented a popular account of the civil leadership—the statesmen—of the Confederacy. Davis, the president, is the villain; Benjamin, the "brains of the Confederacy," is the hero. It is a chronicle of confusion, discord, dissension, and incompetency that causes one to wonder why and how the Confederacy survived as long as it did. The answer is Lee and the military defense of Virginia and early Federal incompetency and dissension in both East and West. In this book, however, consideration of the southern military leadership is studiously avoided. The army and its leaders are barely mentioned and little space is given to the effect of military success or failure on the policies and performance of the statesmen.

The author suggests that if Confederate statesmanship had been as capable and successful as military leadership the outcome would have been different. The validity of this argument is open to question. Man for man there was little

to choose between the statesmen and the military men. Regardless of the quality and ability of the statesmen, if the soldiers could not win battles and overcome the opposing forces, anything the statesmen accomplished would have gone for naught.

Like so many writers, the author, so far as he discusses the subject at all, considers the military conduct of the war from the standpoint of Lee and Virginia. Yet, it was defeats elsewhere than in Virginia that finally forced his surrender. Bragg marched back and forth across Tennessee and Kentucky and in the end accomplished little; his successor, Joseph E. Johnston, was driven farther into the lower South and Hood, who followed, was destroyed, while Federal forces occupied the sources of Lee's supplies and reinforcements. Pemberton, with Davis's approval, insisted on defending Vicksburg and lost all; Holmes, Price, Taylor, and Kirby Smith accomplished practically nothing in the trans-Mississippi region.

The author's conclusions, stated in the prologue, are that the Confederacy failed because it "produced no statesmen" and because it was "founded on a principle that made impossible the orderly conduct of public affairs." We are in general agreement with this statement, but do not find it substantiated in the discussion that follows. The ineptitude of southern diplomats and diplomacy is set forth, and the conflict between the opposing exponents of state rights and an increasingly centralized federal government are hinted at. Nowhere, however, do we find any fundamental analysis of the reasons for this conflict nor an appreciation of the fact that the opposition to Davis was a result, not only of personal disagreement and antipathy, but more particularly of military failure.

Essentially this book is a series of narrative portraits of some of the civil leaders of the Confederacy rather than an attempt to analyze their thinking and acts. The author devotes over one half of his account to a discussion of Davis, Benjamin, and the diplomatic efforts of the Confederate government in European countries and in Mexico and Canada. Most of the remainder considers the activities of the malcontents, Joe Brown, Toombs, Vance, and others, Confederate finance, and the blockade. Seddon and the administration of the Confederate War Department are, however, barely mentioned.

The author goes behind the scenes and half-forgotten men are brought back to life. The period is put in fresh perspective, the central thesis being that the Confederacy failed because of bitter internal conflict with resulting secession within its own ranks. There are a number of illustrations, occasional footnotes, a bibliography of printed materials used, and an index.

Port Washington, New York

THOMAS ROBSON HAY

Thaddeus Stevens. By Alphonse B. Miller. (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1939. Pp. xi, 440. Bibliography, frontispiece. \$4.00.)

Professional historical scholars have not bothered to study the career of Thaddeus Stevens with exhaustive care. He appears in the pages of Reconstruction studies as a "sinister" dictator who lashed a hesitant and semispineless Radical following into support of a vicious program of political revenge, economic exploitation, and social reorganization of the defeated South. Pitiless prejudice, narrow fanaticism, and misdirected idealism are presented or implied as the primary motives of this sour old nemesis of injustice. Yet, a careful analysis of this "club-footed Robespierre" has never been attempted. The recent resurrection and re-evaluation of the reputations of various "defenders of the South during reconstruction" has led Alphonse Miller, one of America's better historical journalists, to try his hand at producing a definitive and balanced historical portrait of this Pennsylvania pariah. Considering the lethargy or conscious avoidance of this task by the professional historians, it may be less than good taste to point out the obvious shortcomings of Mr. Miller's work.

The absence of footnotes is a serious blemish which the author attempts unsuccessfully to excuse in his preface. For instance, the suspicion that a letter of Stevens to Winfield Scott (quoted on pp. 79-80) was actually written in 1852 rather than 1842 would be resolved if the exact citation had been included. Much of the narrative is contrived by the uncritical piecing together and paraphrasing of its subject's printed speeches. Chronology is outraged in the early chapters with observations taken indiscriminately from various periods of Stevens' long life. Politics and personalities are the keynotes of the 1820's and 1830's rather than sections and economic issues. The Compromise of 1850 still reveals Webster and Clay in the leading roles (on the authority of McMaster and James G. Blaine), while George Fort Milton's earnest attempt to cast Stephen A. Douglas as the hero in that drama is ignored, but the most pronounced demonstrations of smug acceptance of orthodox viewpoints are reserved for the Civil War and Reconstruction years. Here again we are told that the nation was back of Stevens' program in 1866-1867, while President Johnson represented only a clique of politicians, rebels, and Democrats. Likewise, we are asked to believe that the black codes were vicious conspiracies to return the ex-slave to servitude; the Freedmen's Bureau was a relief organization, not a political machine; Carl Schurz was a reliable observer and commentator on southern conditions in 1865; the Republican party (not the Union party) elected Lincoln and Johnson in 1864; and finally that without Radical insistence the Confederate debt would never have been repudiated. In the midst of this Trinitarian parade the really significant question of whether Stevens was serving as a stooge for the newer economic kings is given a few pages of disjointed discussion and then dropped.

Mr. Miller's historical techniques and narrative style may leave much to be

desired but he has a delicious facility with vivid adjectives, as illustrated by his references to Buchanan as "the senescent wobbler" and "that anile fuss-budget." His five-line description of John C. Frémont (p. 111) is a masterpiece of condensation and interpretation. Stevens' record as an Antimasonic state legislator and as the wheelhorse who secured a Pennsylvania charter for the second Bank of the United States after that financial institution had been crippled by President Jackson, is told in authoritative fashion. Likewise, Stevens is convincingly presented as the one clear-sighted member of Congress who supplied Lincoln with the legislation and taxation necessary for the vigorous prosecution of the war, including such distasteful laws as the draft and green-back enactments. Stevens' thesis of the nonoperation of the Constitution in the seceding states (p. 198) is presented in a straightforward fashion, while the author's evaluation of Stevens' motives during Reconstruction (p. 226) can be accepted as sad but true. The curious public and the casual student may relish these "saving graces" but scholars will continue to wait for a satisfactory study of "Old Thad."

Wilson Teachers College

ALBERT V. HOUSE, JR.

Son of Carolina. By Augustus White Long. (Durham: Duke University Press, 1939. Pp. x, 280. \$3.00.)

Augustus White Long was born, the son of a village merchant and Confederate soldier, in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, during the Civil War. Overcoming the difficulties that faced a local tradesman's son orphaned at an early age, and the poverty-stricken conditions that prevailed during the Reconstruction period, he graduated from the reopened University of North Carolina in 1885 and studied later at Johns Hopkins and Harvard. After an active life spent in teaching English at Old Trinity College in North Carolina, Wofford College in South Carolina, Lawrenceville School in New Jersey, and Princeton University, he has now retired to Brevard, North Carolina, from whence he has issued this volume as an attempt "to recapture something of the spirit of [his] day and time in the hope that it may entertain the general reader for an hour or prove of interest to those who have an eye on the American scene."

In the light of the purpose for which it was designed, the volume must be characterized as a distinct success. There are no dull pages, and if a certain number of trivialities are included, it should be remembered that the author states that he is "not an economist or a preacher or a philosopher" but merely a simple citizen who has passed the age of seventy and, according to Mark Twain, has a right to do as he pleases. There are vivid accounts of childhood experiences during the Reconstruction period, of student life at the University of North Carolina in the 1880's, of graduate work at Johns Hopkins and Harvard, and of the author's early contacts with the teaching profession at Old Trinity and Wofford. There are also lengthy descriptions of intimate acquaint-

churches containing slaveholding members." By 1860 only three missionaries were left in the South, one in Delaware and two in Kentucky.

It would be illuminating, indeed, to know how the few missionaries to the South described their duties and interpreted their environment. Pastors in the field wrote quarterly reports to the secretary of the society, and these reports the author frequently cites except in the case of southern missionaries. No mention is made of the fact that some missionaries preached to slave congregations with the approval of planters; no statement is made of the difficulties of work in the South; and no description is set down of the personal trials and tribulations of the missionary. But this is understandable as the South was never as important as the West in the annals of the home missionary movement.

Perhaps the volume suffers because its scope is too ambitious. Had the author contented himself with only a history of the American Home Missionary Society, he might have secured a unity which the present volume lacks, and he would have had greater opportunity to bring his energies to bear upon a central theme. Then, too, he might have omitted, without serious loss, a background of four or five chapters and concentrated upon the nineteenth century which he says is his particular time period.

The volume is a most thorough and comprehensive narrative, and will be welcomed by those interested not only in the history of religions, but also in the westward movement.

Miami University

PHILIP D. JORDAN

A Short History of the American Negro. By Benjamin Brawley. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939. Pp. xv, 288. Illustrations, bibliography. \$2.00.)

It has been said that the Negro is the one race that cannot be permitted to enter into the full promise of American life; that it is the one element in the body politic that may be tolerated and utilized but not fully absorbed. This short history of the American Negro—now in its fourth edition—attempts to present the history of the race in the United States in its manifold aspects, to study the actual life of the race itself and in connection with that of the nation. Beginning with the coming of the Negro to America in the colonial era, during which period he passed from a condition of servitude into real slavery, the various phases of his history are traced period by period through slavery and emancipation to the present day. This revised edition has been completely rewritten and is an improvement over earlier editions, the first of which was published in 1913. The criticism that the ante-bellum period was overemphasized in earlier editions has been avoided by devoting 157 out of a total of 268 pages of text to the years since the War between the States. Consequently, more space is given to the years since the World War; approximately 60 pages are given to this period. The material since 1918 constitutes what is perhaps the

most valuable part of the book, as it is the part least known to the average reader of Negro history. Throughout the volume the emphasis is on social history. Education, art, music, and literature are treated at length. This work will continue to supply the need for a brief history of the American Negro. Its organization and treatment of material, together with questions for review, lends itself readily for use in the classroom or for general reading.

In this revised edition can be found the reviewer's major criticism of earlier editions: the work is too much an omnibus of the wrongs and grievances of the Negro race. Most of the examples of self-pity and feeling of martyrdom of a minority group are to be found in this volume. The content is permeated with a feeling of bitterness, frustration, and social unrest and discontent, as illustrated in the following quotation: "In spite of this [valorous] record—perhaps in some measure because of it— . . . the Negro became in the course of the [World] war the victim of proscription and propaganda probably without parallel in the history of the country. No effort seems to have been spared to discredit him both as a soldier and as a man" (p. 191). This constitutes a negative rather than a positive approach. A history of the American Negro could serve a twofold purpose: to give the white man a knowledge of the Negro's accomplishments, aims, and problems as a guide to his appreciating and understanding the Negro's problems; and to give the Negro pride and a quickening of racial consciousness based upon actual accomplishments rather than real or imaginary wrongs and grievances. Such a positive program could do much to solve many of the acute racial problems of this nation.

Louisiana Historical Records Survey Project

V. L. BEDSOLE

The Formation of the State of Oklahoma, 1803-1906. By Roy Gittinger. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1939. Pp. xii, 309. Bibliography, maps, appendices. \$2.50.)

Ten years after the admission of Oklahoma to the Union Dean Gittinger published through the University of California Press a detailed survey of the movements which culminated in that event. Since the book has been out of print for some time, the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the territory to white settlement has furnished an appropriate occasion for the University of Oklahoma Press to issue a "new edition." Unfortunately, this volume can scarcely be considered more than a reissue. The preface has been rewritten entirely, and a two-page supplement has been tacked on to the bibliography. One note has been omitted (p. 55 of first edition), while another has been added (p. 95). If the new edition has 53 pages more than the first one, this is due, not to new material, but to the use of larger type and a smaller page.

The volume under review has, then, precisely the merits and shortcomings of the original edition. At the time of its appearance it was considered a scholarly contribution to western history. A masterpiece of patient research, it

presents the dry facts of a century of Oklahoma history in convenient summary. Many of the topics touched upon are of more than local interest: the removal of the Indians, the agitation for a transcontinental railroad, the separation of Kansas and Nebraska, the Indian Territory during the Civil War and Reconstruction, the settlement of the region by the whites, and the fight for statehood. The sources used are chiefly government documents. No manuscript material is cited, although it is obvious that the records of the Federal departments and the papers of congressional committees would throw much light on many phases of Oklahoma history. No use was made of newspaper files, although the press of the nation and of the territories expressed conflicting views as to such matters as the admission of Oklahoma to statehood. Leaders mentioned remain mere names. There is no attempt to invest John Ross, Elias Boudinot, or Dennis Flynn with flesh and blood.

The final chapter on "The Admission of Oklahoma" fails to do justice to a dramatic struggle which was much in the limelight at the time. The picturesque tour of inspection of New Mexico, Arizona, Oklahoma, and the Indian Territory by the Beveridge committee in 1902 is dismissed in one sentence as "a series of public hearings" (p. 245) which the reader will assume took place in Washington. The report made by the committee to the Senate is mentioned (p. 244), but there is no analysis of the findings which led it to recommend the admission of Oklahoma and the Indian Territory as one state, while it reported adversely with respect to the other territories. The long-drawn-out debate in the Senate during the winter of 1902-1903 is scarcely mentioned, and little light is thrown on the motives which prompted Matthew S. Quay to champion the measure, and Beveridge to filibuster to the end of the session to defeat it. Nor is the reader told just why the fate of Oklahoma—with its larger population and greater economic development—was tied up with that of "the cactus bush plantations" of the Southwest.

It is excusable that a doctoral dissertation published twenty-three years ago should be based on the more accessible sources. Nor is it surprising that rather superficial use was made of some of the numerous documents cited. However, it is to be regretted that the absorption of the author in administration duties and the teaching of English history should have prevented his giving us a genuine revision. Certainly the seven lines devoted to the constitutional convention of 1906-1907 should have given way to a thorough treatment based on the journal of the convention, which has been preserved by the Oklahoma Historical Society. The recent books cited on pages 95 and 288-90, especially those by Annie H. Abel, Edward E. Dale, and Grant Foreman, could have been used with great advantage. This is also true of other books which are not listed at all—e. g.: Claude G. Bowers' *Beveridge and the Progressive Era*, Gordon Hines' *Alfalfa Bill*, and George F. Milton's *The Age of Hate*. Without

doubt the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* contain other worthwhile articles beside the one listed on page 290.

Gittinger's study is useful, but it can hardly be considered "definitive in its field."

University of New Mexico

MARION DARGAN

The Lure of Kentucky: A Historical Guide Book. By Maude Ward Lafferty. (Louisville: The Standard Printing Company, 1939. Pp. xvii, 369. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

This book is written to acquaint the people of Kentucky with their own state and to induce tourists from elsewhere to come to see what scenery, industries, resources, noted homes, and other attractions may be found within her bounds.

In as far as you have a story, it is a sort of travelogue and is arranged in a novel, unique way. In the first two chapters which may be called introductory, entitled "The Lure" and "The Romance," are pointed out mainly who were the early settlers of the state, from whence they came, how they lived, when they arrived, and what was the political organization set up therein. In the third and last introductory chapter, "The Way," there is an explanation of how the highways of Kentucky received their numbers and what has been done for safety thereon.

The author follows successively each of the seventeen Federal highways that thread their way in every direction throughout eighty-seven of the counties of the state, gives an historical sketch of each county through which passes one or more of these roads, and points out who helped make the county noted, and what are the chief points of interest in each. Nor are the thirty-seven of the commonwealth's remaining counties, which have only good state roads, forgotten; their attractions also receive ample attention.

Since by far the major portion of the book consists in describing the attractions along the Federal highways, the book obviously can only make a unit of one of these roads at a time. It is the history of each county and the personalities involved which prevent the book from seeming to be fragmentary and without unity, and they serve to hold the reader's attention. The book represents a prodigious amount of labor. The bibliography given is limited and can represent only the more important sources for the historical data used. There is evidence that the author consulted numerous papers, magazines, pamphlets, and road maps not included in her list of references. There is a brief index.

In searching through such a variety of county histories, folklore, and tradition it is not surprising that some historical errors crept into this tour book of Kentucky. Among the errors it may be noted that on page 123, General Simon B. Buckner was not only a brigadier general in the service of the Confederacy but rose to be a lieutenant general in that service; and he was not a candidate for president in 1896, as stated, but was a candidate for vice-president. Also

it seems that it was Senator John J. Ingalls of Kansas and not Ingles of Missouri, as the book has it, who delivered the panegyric on bluegrass as given on pages 271-72. The historic errors are of minor importance and detract but slightly from the purpose of the book.

Mrs. Lafferty has made a distinct and helpful contribution for the practical use of Kentuckians and for others who may come this way. What has not been well known about Kentucky will be much better known now; the data added will act as a leaven to her home people in a better understanding of their heritage.

Western Kentucky Teachers College

A. M. STICKLES

A Century of Wayne County, Kentucky, 1800-1900. By Augusta Phillips Johnson. (Louisville: Standard Printing Company, 1939. Pp. xi, 281. Illustrations, bibliography. \$2.00.)

County histories are too often confined to short accounts of prominent families, and to lists of county officers, marriages, wills, etc. Such was the original plan of this book, but fortunately the author departed somewhat therefrom. The community was near the Wilderness Road over which many settlers came after the Revolution. At least forty Revolutionary soldiers located in what became Wayne County. One of Isaac Shelby's companions, when he came to Kentucky to locate bounty lands, was a surveyor named Joshua Jones, who liked the country so well that he returned to Virginia and brought out his family in the late 1790's and settled near Monticello. There the Jones, Saufley, Kendrick, Taul, Phillips, Chrisman, Tuttle, Van Winkle, and other pioneer families contributed to a superior citizenship in that part of the state.

Outside capital became interested in the salt industry of the county early in the century and accidentally struck oil in 1819 at a depth of 536 feet. Many years later this first well of its kind became a part of a small, profitable oil field. In 1819, however, its flow of nauseating "Devil's Tar" became a problem when the stream near by into which the oil flowed caught fire. Soon thereafter the well was stopped up with sand.

Southern sympathizers predominated in the county during the Civil War. Wayne suffered little, however, though there was some fighting in it. Monticello, the county seat, was occupied in turn by Confederates and Federals, and Morgan's Raiders are included in the account. Unfortunately the author very wrongly states that she took a long quotation (pp. 121-23) from Colonel James B. McCreary's Diary, when her only source was the reviewer's *Old Cane Springs*, which she quotes again (pp. 128-29) with the proper acknowledgment. Nevertheless, the long quotations, in one instance twenty-seven pages of a Civil War diary, give the work a substantial historical value. The two dozen quaint illustrations also add to the book's interest. The index would be more useful if it contained other items besides names of persons.

Eastern Kentucky State Teachers College

JONATHAN T. DORRIS

They Found It In Natchez. By Theodora Britton Marshall and Gladys Crail Evans. (New Orleans: Pelican Publishing Company, 1939. Pp. 236. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

Since a first glance at *They Found It In Natchez* may shock grammatical and genealogical purists, who doubtless feel that not even the title of a book about Natchez should involve obscure antecedents, it will be well to state at the outset that the "they" who found "it" includes any number of charming people as far removed from one another chronologically as the Natchez Indians and our own Garden pilgrims. As a matter of fact, *They Found It In Natchez* was obviously intended as a pilgrim's handbook and should ultimately be judged on its merits as such. It is written in a sprightly if slightly rococo style. For their information the authors have not depended solely upon the traditions derived from their intimate association with the Natchez milieu. They have employed some of the standard source materials and have quoted them generously. Despite an infelicitous choice of type and a page format which could be improved by more spacious margins, the general appearance of the book is satisfactory; and the illustrations, consisting of old prints and modern sketches and photographs, are unusually good.

By way of doing justice to their title the writers have hit upon a pretty motif; to wit, that throughout its existence Natchez has been the realization of countless searches for aristocratic felicity. Granting an element of fact, one must nevertheless regret that too much has been made of a good conceit. The Natchez Indians may have "realized" their "ideals" and "lived the Good Life" in Natchez; French intellectuals may have found their "Noble Savage" in Natchez; Tory Cavaliers may have found there a refuge from the fury of the American Revolution; the "dashing Dons and demure Senoritas of Old Castile" may have "found . . . what they were seeking, in Natchez"; the Cotton Kings may have realized a Utopia there; the slaves may have found a "Promised Land" on the Natchez plantations; and modern pilgrims may find in Natchez the relics of an unbelievably glorious past; but one finds it somewhat difficult to think of the Mississippi River "like the river spawn and all who came to Natchez" as finding there "what it was seeking, a way of life, a channel, direction and gratification for the urgency of its current," whatever that means.

Whatever vagaries of interpretation they have indulged elsewhere, the authors have been entirely correct in stressing the postwar social and economic isolation of Natchez as responsible for its remarkable state of preservation. Scornful of railroads and aloof in its aristocratic poverty, it lived to itself and refused to ape the fashions of a new age. Otherwise, "American Gothic" would no doubt have wrought there the irreparable havoc it did wherever else there was money enough to procure the trick work of the jigsaw and the turning lathe.

All things considered, *They Found It In Natchez* is worth the pilgrim's money. Of its kind, it is a degree above the average in intelligence and literary

style. The historian, of course, will be annoyed that the work is more art than history: that it wants objectivity of treatment and lacks a bibliography and systematic footnotes. Possibly, to the Natchez way of thinking, a gentleman's word is still just as valid as a historian's footnote. At any rate, it must be admitted that the authors have seen their public and written for it, and the task has been done with relish and enthusiasm.

Mississippi State College

JOHN K. BETTERSWORTH

One Hundred Years at V. M. I. Volumes I and II. By Colonel William Couper. (Richmond: Garrett and Massie, Incorporated, 1939. Pp. ix, 360; vii, 345. Illustrations. \$6.00.)

Here is a full dress history of the Virginia Military Institute by a former cadet, now Executive Officer. To an intimate personal acquaintance with V. M. I., the author has added long and patient study and collation of a bewildering mass of minutes, orders, letters, reports, biographical sketches, public and private archives, all miraculously preserved from the ravages of fire, theft, and hostilities. Colonel Couper has caused to pass in review the antecedents, inception, development, and official and student life of V. M. I., not in mass formation but in single file, the better to invite the reader's attention to the minutest details and utmost ramifications. His zeal and the inherent romance of his subject keeps this long procession from becoming tedious. Although there are rather numerous and lengthy quotations from source materials, they are so well selected that they add flavor without unduly retarding the progress of the narrative, which flows along through the lives of members of the Board of Visitors, faculty, students, and alumni, sometimes taking the reader ultramural into fields of war and fortune. Abounding in episode and digression, the work, nevertheless, as a story maintains the requisite unity in the unfolding of the grand ideal of the Institute.

The first volume begins with the founding at Lexington of a state arsenal, upon which was engrafted twenty-three years later, in 1839, a military and scientific educational function. The corps of cadets replaced the militia. In a day when thrift in public expenditures was highly esteemed by legislators and citizens alike, the founding fathers largely sold their idea to the General Assembly on the basis that it would cost the commonwealth little more to operate the arsenal with two professors and thirty-two state-supported cadets than one officer and twenty-two enlisted men. Thus an unproductive repository for more or less obsolete arms became a dynamic center of education destined to affect profoundly the life of Virginia and to become an influence even in the life of the nation. The academic expansion of 1856-1859 brought the Institute gratifyingly within the goal of its founders, to exemplify at one and the same time the United States Military Academy and L'Ecole Polytechnique.

The second volume begins with the John Brown raid and the cadets' first

military expedition. It shows the state preparing for defense and the gathering and burst of war clouds. Three days after Virginia seceded the Superintendent, Colonel Francis H. Smith, was appointed to the Governor's war council; and the day thereafter the cadets marched away to become drillmasters for the raw volunteer organizations pouring into the camps around Richmond. Thomas J. Jackson, who in 1851 had resigned as major of the First Regiment, United States artillery, to join the faculty as professor of natural and experimental philosophy and instructor in artillery tactics, was in rapid succession commissioned as major of engineers, colonel of infantry, brigadier general, and major general; and by October, 1862, "Stonewall" had become a lieutenant general in the Provisional Army of the Confederate States and the world's greatest corps commander. Men of V. M. I. everywhere rose to military positions of prominence. The cadets were reassembled at Lexington on January 1, 1862, but in May they took the field for three weeks as a part of "Old Jack's" forces. A year later they escorted his body to its grave. In August, November, and December, 1863, and May and June, 1864, the corps served seven emergency tours of active duty with the army, most outstanding of which was the participation in the battle of New Market. On June 25, 1864, the corps returned to a campus in its absence reduced to ruins by hostile raiders. Two days later the class of 1864 was graduated seven days ahead of time, and the underclassmen were furloughed, but many reported at the front. On December 28, 1864, academic work was resumed in an abandoned almshouse at Richmond; but was again recessed in favor of combat March 11 to April 2, 1865. Upon the evacuation of Richmond the corps was dispersed, reassembling at Lexington on October 16 to occupy rude huts in the shadow of war-desolated ruins.

There is a foreword by General George C. Marshall, a V. M. I. graduate and now chief of staff, United States army. There are maps, drawings, and photographs, and there will be an index and bibliography in the fourth volume.

Norfolk Navy Yard

WILLIAM M. ROBINSON, JR.

A Centennial History of the University of Louisville. By Kentucky Writers' Project of the Work Projects Administration. (Louisville: University of Louisville, 1939. Pp. vi, 301. Illustrations, bibliography. \$1.50.)

The Louisville Medical Institute was incorporated in 1833. With the failure of efforts to transfer the medical department of Transylvania University to Louisville, the city assumed control of the Institute in 1837. A Collegiate Institute also was founded to offer academic instruction. In 1846 the University of Louisville was chartered to include the medical and academic institutes, as well as a newly created law school. The inadequately financed academic department ultimately (1855) was taken over by the city school board and, as the Male High School (1860), continued to grant degrees until 1913.

Improved national standards for professional training stimulated revival of the academic department of the University in 1907. Optimism responsible for the announcement of seventy courses proved unwarranted, and subscription of a meager "Founders' Fund" was necessary to enable a modicum of the projected work to begin. The Flexner Report (1910), while primarily concerned with the medical school, scathingly indicted the academic department. Dr. John L. Patterson, however, secured a modest municipal appropriation for the College of Arts and Sciences which, in 1915, was accredited by the Southern Association. Assignment of revenues derived from taxation to the University (1916) subsequently made possible expansion, resulting in the establishment of schools of dentistry (1918), engineering (1925), and music (1932), and the creation of a Negro college in 1931.

Chapters I-V of the volume are based on careful research, in large measure attributable to Professor W. C. Mallalieu's interest in the project. The lucid and well-proportioned narrative is carefully documented and vivified by apposite quotation from the sources. Adequate attention is given to distinguished faculty members; the history of the University is not portrayed as a mere succession of administrative triumphs. Commendable restraint has been exercised in the inclusion of anecdotal material which frequently impairs the value of university histories.

The account of the Colvin controversy (pp. 194-204) is not wholly satisfying. In view of the unfortunate consequences of President Colvin's brief tenure of office the reader is entitled to ask how and why he was selected. There is also reason to believe that his reactionary views on the teaching of history, economics, and science played a larger part in the faculty upheaval of 1926-1927 than the narrative implies.

Chapters VI and VII are encumbered by many details that might continue to repose in catalogues and annual reports (pp. 171, 178, 180-85, *et passim*). The touch of the trained historian, evident in the early chapters, at times seems to be missing.

The Louisville Normal School did not bow to immolation on the altar of progress with the resignation implied by the brief discussion (p. 221) of the teacher-training problem, actually provocative of considerable controversy and heartburning. At least a note might have called attention to the fact that an eminent educator, upon conclusion of a survey, presented recommendations at variance with the final decision.

Despite such minor criticisms that might be made the volume should rank high among university histories. No student of the history of American education, particularly in medicine and law, can afford to overlook it. The notes include biographical sketches of individuals given passing attention in the text. The bibliography is adequate and well arranged. Illustrations add much to the interest and attractiveness of the volume.

Louisiana State University

CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

History of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, 1889-1939. By David A. Lockmiller. Foreword by Frank P. Graham. (Raleigh: General Alumni Association of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering of the University of North Carolina, 1939. Pp. xvii, 310. Bibliography, illustrations, appendices. \$2.50.)

This history of the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering at Raleigh, North Carolina, was written as a contribution to the semi-centennial celebration of the founding of the College. Students and alumni and those interested in the development of education in North Carolina will find many interesting facts in this account of an institution which has meant much to the state of North Carolina from its founding as the North Carolina College of Agriculture and Mechanical Arts under the influence of Colonel Leonidas Polk and the Watauga Club, through the period when it was known as the North Carolina State College of Agriculture and Engineering, and on to its present status as a unit of the University of North Carolina.

As chairman of the department of history and government at State College, Professor Lockmiller was able to obtain all of the records for what he calls "an inventory of fifty years of progress." This inventory includes the names of trustees, presidents, and deans, a large number of the members of the faculty, changes in the curricula, and student activities such as clubs, publications, and athletics. The physical growth of the institution and the increasing services to the state are carefully followed. This information is given clearly and concisely in well-organized chronological order. The appendices are well chosen to enable the reader to follow the legislative background of the founding and development of the institution: the Morrill Act, Hatch Act, Act Establishing State College, Smith-Lever Act, etc.

Although he gives so much of his attention to factual material, Professor Lockmiller shows skill in the excellent character studies of some of the presidents of State College, such as Alexander Quarles Holladay, Daniel Harvey Hill, and Wallace Carl Riddick.

Since the progress of general education in North Carolina and particularly the interest in agricultural education in the 1890's was so closely associated with the political developments of those years, the historian will regret that he does not find a fuller discussion of the relation of political activities to the founding and growth of State College. It is obvious, however, that such a discussion would necessitate a much longer book or a book of a different character, and one can only hope that Professor Lockmiller will deal with this important phase of the subject in another book or in an article.

Historical News and Notices

The chairman of the membership committee of the Southern Historical Association, Hugh T. Lefler of the University of North Carolina, announces the following personnel for 1940: Horace Adams, Arkansas Agricultural and Mechanical College, Monticello; Louis K. Koontz, University of California at Los Angeles; W. Neil Franklin, The National Archives, Washington; Miss Dorothy Dodd, Box 323, Jacksonville, Florida; J. P. Dyer, Armstrong Junior College, Savannah; Powell Moore, Indiana University Extension Division, East Chicago, Indiana; James H. Poteet, Western Kentucky Teachers College, Bowling Green; Garnie W. McGinty, Louisiana Polytechnic Institute, Ruston; Ralph B. Flanders, New York University, New York City; R. P. Hilldrump, East Carolina Teachers College, Greenville, North Carolina; James W. Moffitt, Oklahoma Historical Society, Oklahoma City; Charles E. Cauthen, College Place, Columbia, South Carolina; Thomas P. Govan, University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee; Robert D. Meade, Randolph-Macon Woman's College, Lynchburg, Virginia; V. L. Wharton, Millsaps College, Jackson, Mississippi; Claude Elliott, Southwest Texas State Teachers College, San Marcos; Richard H. Shryock, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia; Charles G. Summersell, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa; and Lewis E. Atherton, University of Missouri, Columbia.

PERSONAL

The fourth series of Walter Lynwood Fleming Lectures in Southern History, sponsored by the Graduate School and the Department of History of Louisiana State University, was delivered by Thomas P. Abernethy of the University of Virginia, February 27-29. Choosing as his subject, "The Virginia Frontiers," Professor Abernethy presented "The Tidewater," "The Piedmont and Valley," and "Kentucky." The 1941 series will be given by Douglas S. Freeman, editor of the *Richmond News Leader*.

Mary Wilhelmina Williams, professor of American history at Goucher College, has resigned to retire from active teaching, effective with this academic year. She will return to her native state, California, and expects to continue research in Latin American history. Dorothea Wyatt has been appointed to the vacancy caused by Professor Williams' resignation. Dr. Wyatt is a graduate of Leland Stanford Junior University, took her doctor's degree at Radcliffe College, where she also served as a tutor. Subsequently she has been serving in the Department of History at Milwaukee-Downer College.

Alfred B. Sears of the University of Oklahoma, who is writing a biography of John Breckinridge (1760-1806), would be grateful for information concerning any unprinted letters by, to, or about him; and hitherto unused manuscript materials throwing light on the Kentucky Resolutions of 1798 or Breckinridge's part in the history of Virginia and early Kentucky.

With a grant from the University of Missouri Research Council, Lewis E. Atherton of the University of Missouri will spend the summer in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama working on country mercantile records from about 1830 to 1860.

Elmer Ellis of the University of Missouri is working in the Huntington Library on a biography of Finley Peter Dunne.

"Problems of Research in Medieval History" was the subject of an address by A. C. Krey of the University of Minnesota, delivered before the Trinity College Historical Society of Duke University, February 1.

Two members of the history staff at the University of Mississippi will be away during the summer engaged in research: B. I. Wiley in the field of Confederate history at various points in the South, particularly at the University of Texas and Louisiana State University; and J. J. Mathews in the field of modern European history in the Widener Library, Cambridge.

The passing of William E. Dodd on February 9 at the age of seventy-one removes from the historical profession one of the pioneers in the field of southern history. Born in North Carolina on October 21, 1869, he received his formal training at Virginia Polytechnic Institute (B.S., 1895; M.S., 1897) and at the University of Leipzig (Ph.D., 1900). His dissertation was *Jefferson's Rückkehr sur Politik* (1900). Professor Dodd began his career as a teacher of history at Virginia Polytechnic Institute, 1895-1897. After receiving his doctorate he served as professor of history at Randolph-Macon College for eight years, and from 1908 until his appointment as ambassador to Germany in 1933 he was professor of American history at the University of Chicago. Following a quadrennium at the Berlin post he returned to the United States, lectured on international relations, and resumed historical writing at his country home at Round Hill, Virginia. Several of Professor Dodd's works were biographical: *Life of Nathaniel Macon* (1903), *Life of Jefferson Davis* (1907), *Woodrow Wilson and His Work* (1921), *Statesmen of the Old South* (1911), and *Lincoln or Lee* (1928). The last two works were the outgrowth of lecture series. He served as editor of the *Riverside History of the United States*, 4 vols., to which he contributed the third volume, *Expansion and Conflict* (1915), and as joint editor, with Ray Stannard Baker, of *The Public Papers of Woodrow Wilson*, 2 vols. (1925). His *The Cotton Kingdom* (1919), a volume in the *Chronicles of America Series*, is a cross-section of the deep South in the last decade of the

ante-bellum period, and his most recent work, *The Old South: Struggles for Democracy* (1937), a history of the southern colonies in the seventeenth century, was designed as the first of a four-volume treatise on the South to 1860. In 1934 Professor Dodd served as president of the American Historical Association.

The following summer session appointments in the historical guild have been reported to the *Journal* office: J. P. Dyer of Armstrong Junior College to teach at the Georgia State College for Women; Chester M. Destler of Georgia Teachers College, Collegeboro, and John M. Sirich of Queens College, Long Island, to teach at Tulane University; Ralph P. Bieber of Washington University, B. J. Loewenberg of the University of South Dakota, H. A. DeWeerd of Denison University, and H. C. Nixon to teach at the University of Missouri; D. D. McBrien of Arkansas State Teachers College to teach at the University of Arkansas (first term); David Y. Thomas of the University of Arkansas to teach at the University of Texas (second term); Chase Mooney of Brenau College to teach at the University of Mississippi; A. B. Butts, chancellor of the University of Mississippi, to teach at the University of Hawaii; Paul H. Clyde of Duke University, John A. Davis, Superintendent of Schools of Wood County, West Virginia, and Russell H. Seibert of Western State Teachers College, Kalamazoo, Michigan, to teach at West Virginia University; Thomas E. Ennis of West Virginia University to teach at Purdue University; W. G. Bean of Washington and Lee University, Minnie C. Boyd of Mississippi State College for Women, and Dan Thomas of Temple University to teach at the University of Alabama; Thornton Terhune of Tulane University to teach at the University of Virginia; Frank L. Owsley of Vanderbilt University, Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University, A. R. Newsome of the University of North Carolina, W. H. Callcott of the University of South Carolina, and Thomas D. Clark of the University of Kentucky to teach at Duke University (first term), and Jonathan F. Scott of New York University, W. A. Mabry of Mount Union College, and Culver H. Smith of the University of Chattanooga (second term); James L. Godfrey of the University of North Carolina to teach at the College of William and Mary; E. Merton Coulter of the University of Georgia to teach at Harvard University; and Avery Craven of the University of Chicago to teach at Northwestern University.

The following new appointments have been reported: Bernard Mayo of George Washington University as professor of history at the University of Virginia; and Gerald M. Capers of Yale University as assistant professor of history at Newcomb College.

The following promotions may be noted: Alfred B. Sears and H. C. Peterson of the University of Oklahoma to be associate professors of history; and Josiah C. Russell of the University of North Carolina to be associate professor of history.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

At the regular meeting of the East Tennessee Historical Society at Knoxville, December 1, the following officers were elected for the year 1940: Jennings B. Sanders of the University of Tennessee, president; W. Flinn Rogers of East Tennessee State Teachers College, Mary U. Rothrock of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and John P. Brown of Chattanooga, vice-presidents; Laura E. Luttrell of Knoxville, secretary; Lucile Deaderick of the Lawson-McGhee Library, Knoxville, treasurer; Joseph A. Sharp of Knoxville and Almira Jewell of Maryville College, members of the executive committee. At the same meeting the following editors of the annual *Publications* of the Society were chosen: Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee, managing editor, and Verton M. Queener, Maryville College, editorial associate, for 1940; and W. Neil Franklin, The National Archives, and Culver H. Smith, University of Chattanooga, members of the board of editors for three years.

The South Carolina Historical Society, at its annual meeting on January 12, elected the following officers: J. H. Easterby, College of Charleston, president; A. S. Salley, first vice-president; William Way, second vice-president; John Bennett, third vice-president; N. B. Barnwell, fourth vice-president; and Mabel L. Webber, secretary-treasurer.

The Florida Historical Society held a regional meeting at Mountain Lake Club, Lake Wales, February 9-10. The morning session of February 9 was opened by Mrs. Louise duPont Crowninshield, director of the Society, and the following papers were read: "Dr. Henry Perrine, Hero of Horticulture," by Mrs. Frances F. Cleveland Preston, Princeton, New Jersey; "Recollections of My Great Grandfather, Dr. Henry Perrine," by G. Barrett Rich, Buffalo, New York; "Buckingham Smith, Florida Diplomat and Historian," by A. J. Wall, director of the New York Historical Society; "The Florida Militia and the Affair at Withlacoochee: An Episode in the Seminole Indian War," by Samuel E. Cobb, The National Archives; and "Organization of the Florida Confederate Cattle Battalion," by Theodore Leslie, III, Tampa. At the afternoon session the Rt. Rev. Francis Sadler, O. S. B., Abbot, Saint Leo Abbey, discussed "Benedictine Pioneering in Florida"; and Major H. M. Nornabell, director of Mountain Lake Sanctuary, read a paper on "The Mountain Lake Sanctuary and Singing Tower—Edward W. Bok's Ideals." The guest speaker at the evening session was Mrs. Doris Stone of the Middle American Research Institute, who spoke on "Mexican Resemblances in the Southeastern United States." At the Saturday morning session the program, in addition to papers of interest to high school students, closed with "The Journal of Jonathan Dickenson," by Mrs. Evangeline Walker Andrews.

Sponsored by the University of North Carolina and co-sponsored by the North

Carolina Historical Commission, the State Museum, the Archaeological Society of North Carolina, and the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, a state-wide Works Progress Administration archaeological project has been approved. Its purpose is "to undertake excavations in connection with remains of Indian life and with artifacts from early white settlements, the latter especially at Bath and New Bern."

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Among important manuscript collections recently acquired by West Virginia University are the following: the Ruffner-Donally Papers, 5 letter books and 6 account books of the Kanawha Salines Company, 1836-1868; the Stephen B. Elkins Papers, 12 scrapbooks and some miscellaneous letters bearing on business and politics; the Dayton Papers, approximately 100,000 pieces, chiefly the correspondence of Spencer Dayton, a member of the Virginia Secession Convention, and of Alston G. Dayton, congressman and Federal judge; and the Marshall Papers, some 200 letters from the correspondence of Captain J. W. Marshall of the Confederate army. The University also announces the receipt of the older inactive public records of Tucker, Lewis, and Kanawha counties, (West) Virginia, approximately 5 tons.

The Virginia Historical Society has recently acquired approximately 1,000 letters and other manuscript material connected with the Dabney, Saunders, and Preston families; "A Crisis in Education," being an account of Washington College in 1834; and such museum pieces as wine glasses and tumbler belonging to George Washington; an inlaid wood tea caddy and silver spoon given by General Lafayette to Betty Washington (Mrs. Fielding) Lewis of Kenmore; a beaded purse belonging to Martha Washington; a decanter given to Colonel John Stanard by Andrew Jackson; and a small gold snuff box formerly belonging to General Hugh Mercer.

Two pension-case files of Lincolniana are among the records of the Veterans' Administration in The National Archives. One contains documents relating to Lincoln's representative recruit in the Union army, John S. Staples; the other concerns Mrs. Lincoln and includes her declaration for a widow's pension and several letters written by Robert Todd Lincoln.

The University of Kentucky is undertaking to reprint certain volumes of rare Kentuckiana, a project sponsored by a Committee on Publications created by the Haggin Trust Fund. The first reprint, William Littell's *Festoons of Fancy*, with a foreword by Thomas D. Clark, will be issued soon by the Princeton Press.

Recent accessions to the library of the Florida Historical Society include seventy books pertaining to Florida history, given by Frederick W. Dau; a number of miscellaneous Florida maps; and miscellaneous original letters pertaining

to Florida, presented by Edmund LeRoy Dow of Palm Beach, Mrs. Philip Gardner of Boston, and others.

The Log Cabin Myth, A Study of the Early Dwellings of the English Colonists in North America (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1939, pp. xxii, 243, illustrations, \$2.50), by Harold R. Shurtleff, edited with an introduction by Samuel Eliot Morison, is a work "built upon the foundations laid by [Fiske] Kimball and [Henry C.] Mercer, using much added material gathered over a wider field. It will serve to implement their findings by a larger array of fact. My hope is to add enough documentary proof to theirs to demolish the Log Cabin Myth and definitely solve the problem of the form of dwelling construction used by the earliest English settlers" (pp. 6-7). Although the Scandinavians first introduced the log cabin in 1638 and, independently, the Germans in the early years of the eighteenth century, the Scotch-Irish were the first English-speaking people to appropriate it. "From and through the Germans and Scotch-Irish it spread rapidly through the English colonies, and by the American Revolution had become the typical American frontier dwelling from Maine to Tennessee" (p. 4). Mr. Shurtleff's researches did not reveal a single use of the term *log cabin* in any printed or manuscript sources prior to 1770, although he found five instances of the term *log house* before the end of the seventeenth century: in Maine in 1662, Maryland in 1669, Massachusetts in 1678, North Carolina in 1680, and New Hampshire in 1699; and "only two of the five—possibly only one—were dwelling houses" (p. 9). One chapter, "Virginia and Her Neighbors," and parts of others treat the subject in the southern colonies.

Side Lights on Southern History (Richmond: The Dietz Press, 1939, pp. [xiv], 259, illustrations, \$2.50), by Mary H. Flournoy, with a foreword by Douglas Southall Freeman, embraces a collection of writings from the pen of the historian-general of the United Daughters of the Confederacy. An introductory chapter, "The Value of Southern History and Tradition to the Nation," is followed by a trilogy of essays—art, educational institutions, and literature—in the early South. One Revolutionary character, John Paul Jones, and a post-bellum Virginian, Alexander Hugh Holmes, receive special treatment, but the period of the Confederacy claims seven of the book's thirteen divisions: the secession of the Old Dominion, the relation of the Confederate government to the Indians, the sources of military supplies, the Confederate press, cavalry leaders, Joseph E. Johnston, and Stonewall Jackson's brigade.

The *Publishers' Weekly*, February 10, 1940, contains an article on the *Virginia Quarterly Review* by its managing editor, William Jay Gold. In September, 1939, the *Review* rounded out its fifteenth year. Mr. Gold's article includes a statement of the inception of the magazine, its connection with the University of Virginia, the function of the *Review* and the policies of the editorial staff, and editorial routine.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Privateering from Baltimore during the Spanish American Wars of Independence," by Charles C. Griffin, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).
- "The Rose Croft in Old St. Mary's," by Henry C. Forman, *ibid.*
- "Baltimore, A Pioneer in Organized Baseball," by John H. Lancaster, *ibid.*
- "The Laymen's Libraries and the Provincial Library," by Joseph T. Wheeler, *ibid.*
- "An Early American Patriot [Charles Carroll]," by Edward Mosk and Morey S. Mosk, in the *South Atlantic Quarterly* (January).
- "The Veracity of John Lederer," by Lyman Carrier, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly and Historical Magazine* (October).
- "The Colonial Churches of James City County, Virginia," by George C. Mason, *ibid.*
- "The Syms and Eaton Schools and Their Successor," by Helen Jones Campbell, *ibid.* (January).
- "The Richmond Daily Press on British Intervention in the Civil War," by Schuyler D. Hoslett, *ibid.*
- "An Era of Non-Importation Associations, 1768-73," by Glenn C. Smith, *ibid.*
- "King William County and Its Court House," by Elizabeth H. Ryland, *ibid.*
- "A Crisis in Education, 1834 (Washington College)," continued, by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).
- "'Keswick'—in Powhatan," by E. L. Ryan, *ibid.*
- "William Graham and 'Jockey' Robinson: A Contrast," by Edmund P. Tompkins, *ibid.*
- "The Early Strivings of the Negro in Virginia," by Luther P. Jackson, in the *Journal of Negro History* (January).
- "The Influence of John Chavis and Lunsford Lane on the History of North Carolina," by W. Sherman Savage, *ibid.*
- "Governor Vance and the Peace Movement," I, by Richard E. Yates, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).
- "Contemporary Opinion of Hugh Williamson," by Delbert H. Gilpatrick, *ibid.*
- "Additional Notes on Matthew H. Jouett, Kentucky Portrait Painter," by Samuel M. Wilson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (January).
- "John M. Harlan in Kentucky, 1855-1877: The Story of His Pre-Court Political Career," by Louis Hartz, *ibid.*
- "Governor Keen Johnson," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).
- "Joel Tanner Hart: Kentucky's Poet-Sculptor," by Gayle R. Carver, *ibid.*
- "Some Notes on British Intrigue in Kentucky, 1788-1791," by Schuyler D. Hoslett, *ibid.*
- "The City Manager Plan in Kansas City," by Henry M. Alexander, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (January).

- "The Labor Movement in St. Louis from 1860 to 1890," by Russell M. Nolen, *ibid.*
- "Frontier Economic Problems in Missouri, 1815-1828," II, by Hattie M. Anderson, *ibid.*
- "Governor Robert Maxwell Harris," by John B. Meserve, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).
- "The Beginning of Quaker Administration of Indian Affairs in Oklahoma," by Aubrey L. Steele, *ibid.*
- "Southwestern Oil Boom Towns," by Gerald Forbes, *ibid.*
- "The Civil War in the Indian Territory, 1861," continued, by Dean Trickett, *ibid.*
- "Indian International Fair," by Ella Robinson, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Charles C. S. Winder's Account of a Battle with the Indians," transcribed by I. Ridgeway Trimble, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (March).
- "Early Annapolis Records," compiled by M. L. Radoff, *ibid.*
- "A List of the Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church Ordained after the American Revolution, Who Served in Virginia between 1785 and 1814, and a List of Virginia Parishes and Their Rectors for the Same Period," compiled by G. MacLaren Brydon, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (October).
- "Lucy Long," contributed by Mary Campbell, *ibid.*
- "Documents on the Origin of the Phi Beta Kappa Society," contributed by Ray W. Irwin, *ibid.*
- "Notes from Surry County Records of the Seventeenth Century," contributed by Mrs. Victor W. Stewart, *ibid.*
- "Some Recently Discovered Extracts from the Last Minutes of the Virginia Council and General Court, 1642-1645," edited by Clifford Lewis 3rd, *ibid.* (January).
- "Statement of Captain Christopher Hudson," contributed by Rector Hudson, *ibid.*
- "Documents Relating to the Early History of the College of William and Mary and to the History of the Church in Virginia," contributed by Herbert L. Ganter, *ibid.* (October and January).
- "Norfolk, Portsmouth, and Gosport as Seen by Moreau de Saint-Mery in March, April and May, 1794," translated and edited by Fillmore Norflett, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (January).
- "William Byrd Title Book," continued, edited by R. A. Lancaster, Jr., *ibid.*
- "Unpublished Letters from North Carolinians to Polk," continued, edited by Elizabeth G. McPherson, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (January).

- "Correspondence between Governor Joseph Desha and Amos Kendall—1831-1835," edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (January).
- "Early Marriage Records of Madison County, Kentucky," continued, compiled by W. Rodes Shackelford, *ibid.*
- "Kentucky Marriages and Obituaries," continued, compiled and edited by G. Glenn Clift, *ibid.*
- "Bourbon Circuit Court Records," abstracted by Julia S. Ardery, *ibid.*
- "The Negotiations Leading to the Chickasaw-Choctaw Agreement, January 17, 1837," edited by Gaston L. Litton, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (December).
- "Diary of a Missionary to the Choctaws, 1860-1861," edited by Anna Lewis, *ibid.*

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Christopher Gadsden and the Stamp Act," by Robert H. Woody, in the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association*, 1939.
- "The Nullification Controversy in an Up-Country District," by J. Mauldin Lesesne, *ibid.*
- "The Mud-Sill Theory in South Carolina," by Rosser H. Taylor, *ibid.*
- "The Making of an Ante-Bellum Lady—Mrs. Howell Cobb," by Elizabeth Mays, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "Richmond Oakgrove Plantation," by Savannah Unit, Georgia Writer's Project, Works Progress Administration, *ibid.*
- "The Beginning of Georgia under Her Presidents," by T. P. Waring, *ibid.*
- "Moses Elias Levy Yulee," by George R. Fairbanks, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "The Timucua Indians of Sixteenth Century Florida," by W. W. Ehrmann, *ibid.*
- "The First Protestant Service in North America," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "A Stowe Memorial," by Kenneth W. Hooker, *ibid.*
- "The Survey of Federal Archives in Mississippi," by George E. Schilling, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (October).
- "The Disputed Mississippi Election of 1837-1838," by Dallas C. Dickey, *ibid.*
- "Mother Monroe: Boundaries under Various Laws," by W. A. Evans, *ibid.*
- "History of the First Baptist Church of Starkville, Mississippi, 1839-1939," by B. M. Walker, *ibid.*
- "The Louisiana Lottery Company," by G. W. McGinty, in the *Southwestern Social Science Quarterly* (March).
- "The Exalted Enterprise (The Mississippi Question: The Louisiana Answer)," by William C. Holmes, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "The Louisiana Purchase: The French Viewpoint," by André Lafargue, *ibid.*

- "Types of Privateer Vessels, Their Armament and Flags, in the Gulf of Mexico," by Stanley Faye, *ibid.*
- "A Circulating Library of Ante-Bellum Louisiana," by Walton R. Patrick, *ibid.*
- "According to the Code," by John S. Kendall, *ibid.*
- "The 'Mission' to Ecuador of Judah P. Benjamin," by Louis Gruss, *ibid.*
- "James Robb, Banker and Pioneer Railroad Builder of Ante-Bellum Louisiana," by Harry H. Evans, *ibid.*
- "The University Crosses the Bar," by Robert E. Vinson, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "Administration of the Sequestration Act in the Confederate District Court of the Western District of Texas, 1862-1865," by T. R. Havins, *ibid.*
- "The Influence of French Diplomatic Policy on the Annexation of Texas," by R. A. McLemore, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Addressers of Clinton and Arbuthnot," edited by Robert W. Barnwell, Jr., in the *Proceedings of the South Carolina Historical Association, 1939.*
- "Letters and Papers of Governor David Johnson and Family, 1810-1855," edited by Florence J. Scott, *ibid.*
- "Letters from Col. Lewis Morris to Miss Ann Elliott," continued, contributed by Morris Rutherford, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (January).
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, edited by A. S. Salley, *ibid.*
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "The Thomas Elfe Account Book, 1765-1775," continued, contributed by Mabel L. Webber, copied by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "An Unpublished Letter of Senator Ralph Izard to George Livius, Esq.," edited by Walter A. Reichart, *ibid.*
- "An Andersonville Prison Diary," edited by C. M. Destler, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (March).
- "Papers Relating to the Georgia-Florida Frontier, 1784-1800," XIV, edited and translated by D. C. Corbitt, *ibid.*
- "Old Canoochee Backwoods Sketches," IX, by Julia E. Harn, *ibid.*
- "An 1870 Itinerary from St. Augustine to Miami," in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "Typoscripts of Manuscripts Made by Florida Historical Records Survey," *ibid.*
- "The Charter of Mississippi's First Bank," edited by William D. McCain, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (October).
- "Minutes of the West Florida Assembly," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (January).

- "Jose Julian Martí on Judah Philip Benjamin," edited and translated by Louis Gruss, *ibid.*
- "Records of the Superior Council of Louisiana, January, 1760-December, 1761," LXXXII, by G. Lugano, revised by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, March, 1784," LXIV, by Laura L. Porteous, marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "The Texas Missions in 1785," translated by J. Autrey Dabbs, in *Mid-America* (January).
- "Folk Life in Early Texas: The Autobiography of Andrew Davis," II, contributed by R. L. Jones, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (January).
- "Gómara on the Coronado Expedition," translated by A. Grove Day, *ibid.*
- "Eighty-Six Hours without Water on the Texas Plains," edited by W. Curtis Nunn, *ibid.*
- "A Letter Book of Joseph Eve, United States Chargé d'Affaires to Texas," II, edited by Joseph M. Nance, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "Frederick Douglass and the Woman's Rights Movement," by Benjamin Quarles, in the *Journal of Negro History* (January).
- "A Partial Background for the Study of the Development of Negro Labor," by Samuel E. Warren, *ibid.*
- "The American Churches and the Mexican War," by Clayton S. Ellsworth, in the *American Historical Review* (January).
- "The Two John Nicholases: Their Relationship to Washington and Jefferson," by Manning J. Dauer, *ibid.*
- "The Economic Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson," by Joseph Dorfman, in the *Political Science Quarterly* (March).
- "The John Brown Legend in Pictures: Kissing the Negro Baby," by James C. Malin, in the *Kansas Historical Quarterly* (November).
- "La Salle's Expedition of 1682," by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (January).
- "Reminiscences of an Ohio Volunteer," edited by Philip D. Jordan and Charles M. Thomas, in the *Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Quarterly* (October).

CONTRIBUTORS

GEORGE WORTHINGTON ADAMS is associate professor of history at Lake Forest College.

E. G. CAMPBELL is junior classifier at The National Archives.

LESTER J. CAPPON is archivist and assistant professor of history at the University of Virginia.

C. N. HOWARD is assistant professor of history at the University of California at Los Angeles.

GEORGE C. OSBORN is professor of history at Berry College.

GEORGE E. MOWRY is instructor in history at the University of North Carolina.

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON is Kenan professor of American history and political science and director of the Southern Collection at the University of North Carolina.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

A quarterly journal dealing with the
history of the Latin American countries

JOHN TATE LANNING } EDITORS
ALAN K. MANCHESTER }

Some Cultural Assets of Latin
America

HERBERT E. BOLTON
University of California

The Influence of Horace Mann on the
Educational Ideas of Domingo
Faustino Sarmiento

WATT STEWART
Oklahoma A. & M.
WILLIAM M. FRENCH
Muskingum College

The Continental Treaties of 1856: An
American Union "Exclusive of the
United States"

GUSTAVE A. NUERMBERGER
Duke University Library

José Alvarez de Toledo's Initiation as
a Filibuster, 1811-1813

HARRIS C. WARREN
MacMurray College for
Women

BOOK REVIEWS

DOCUMENTS

NOTES AND COMMENT

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SECTION

SUBSCRIPTION: \$4.00 A YEAR

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
DURHAM, N. C.

FELIX GRUNDY *CHAMPION OF DEMOCRACY*

BY JOSEPH HOWARD PARKS

"The purpose of this book," states the author in his preface,
"is to rescue from oblivion one of the nation's unheralded
masters of political strategy."

This study of Felix Grundy affords a striking picture of fron-
tier politics, and an interesting glimpse into the social forces at
work during the period culminating in the Jacksonian Era.

x, 368 Pages. 5½"×3¼". Buckram. III. \$3.00.

SOUTHERN BIOGRAPHY SERIES, NUMBER 1
LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY PRESS
University —o— Louisiana

The JOURNAL of SOUTHERN HISTORY

Now Available . . .

BACK NUMBERS

\$3.00 A VOLUME
(Unbound)

75c A NUMBER . . .

SOME CONTRIBUTORS

Kathryn T. Abbey
Thomas P. Abernethy
Horace Adams
John D. Barnhart
William C. Binkley
Milledge L. Bonham, Jr.
Thomas D. Clark
E. M. Coulter
Avery Craven
F. Garvin Davenport
Edwin A. Davis
William Diamond
Edgar L. Erickson
Curtis W. Garrison
Paul W. Gates
Thomas P. Govan
Fletcher M. Green
Philip M. Hamer

J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton
Fred H. Herrington
Leonard C. Helderman
William R. Hogan
Albert V. House, Jr.
Herbert A. Keller
Frank J. Klingberg
Fred Landon
William O. Lynch
E. Wilson Lyon
William A. Mabry
Robert D. Meade
George Fort Milton
Allen Moger
A. B. Moore
Jarvis M. Morse
Frank L. Owsley
James W. Patton
Haywood J. Pearce, Jr.

Walter B. Posey
Walter Prichard
P. L. Rainwater
Charles W. Ramsdell
Joseph C. Robert
William M. Robinson, Jr.
Daniel M. Robison
Robert R. Russel
Theodore Salouts
Richard A. Shryock
Roger W. Shugg
Francis B. Simkins
Richard R. Stenberg
Mack Swearingen
Charles S. Sydnor
Harvey Wish
C. Vann Woodward
Robert H. Woody
Richard E. Yates



Write to

James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer

THE

SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

CONVERSE COLLEGE, SPARTANBURG, S. C.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

FRANK L. OWSLEY, Vanderbilt University

VICE-PRESIDENT

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, Converse College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

THOMAS P. ABERNETHY, University of Virginia (1940)

PHILIP M. HAMER, The National Archives (1941)

CHARLES S. SYDNOR, Duke University (1942)

MANAGING EDITOR

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

ELECTED MEMBERS

THOMAS D. CLARK, University of Kentucky (1940)

BELL I. WILEY, University of Mississippi (1940)

KATHRYN T. ABBEY, Florida State College for Women (1941)

AVERY O. CRAVEN, University of Chicago (1941)

MINNIE CLARE BOYD, Mississippi State College for Women (1942)

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina (1942)